Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-103
Wednesday
29 May 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-103 29 May 1991

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gorbachev Spokesman Ignatenko Briefs Press 1
On Gorbachev-Thatcher Talks *[TASS]* 1
On Gorbachev Visit to Scandinavia *[TASS]* 1
'Very Meaningful Dialogue' With Bush *[TASS]* 1
On Gorbachev's Visit to Kazakhstan *[TASS]* 2
Estonian Money-for-Freedom Deal 'Not Right' *[TASS]* 2
On DPRK Decision To Join UN *[TASS]* 2
Prospects for Western Economic Aid Examined *[IZVESTIYA 23 May]* 2
Delegate at CSCE Talks Views Outcome *[TASS]* 4
North Atlantic Assembly Ends, Concern Expressed *[TASS]* 4
Cocom Issues Reduced List of Restricted Products *[PRAVDA 27 May]* 4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Report on Gorbachev-Bush Phone Conversation *[PRAVDA 29 May]* 5
Primakov, Shcherbakov Arrive for Talks *[TASS]* 5
Scientists Offer Advice on Running Moscow *[Moscow International]* 5

China

Journalists View Progress of Chinese Reforms *[PRAVDA 15 May]* 5
Diplomat on Signing of PRC Border Accord *[Moscow International]* 9
Commentary on Evolution of Chinese Relations *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 May]* 10
Chinese Trade Unionists Visit Moscow, Leningrad *[TRUD 22 May]* 11

Northeast Asia

Impact of USSR-ROK Ties on DPRK Viewed *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI 5 May]* 11
PRAVDA Reporter Views DPRK-Japan Talks *[Moscow International]* 12
Report on DPRK's Application to Join UN *[Moscow International]* 13

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentary on Search for Cease-Fire in Cambodia *[Moscow International]* 13
Observer Assesses Prospects for Jakarta Meeting *[Moscow International]* 14

Near East & South Asia

PLO Envoy Discusses Middle East Peace Issues *[TASS]* 14
Commentary on Life, Death of Rajiv Gandhi *[IZVESTIYA 23 May]* 15
New Nepalese Prime Minister Seeks Better Ties *[TASS]* 16
USSR To Help Iran With Oil, Gas Prospecting *[Moscow International]* 16
Deputy Foreign Minister Meets Pakistani Diplomat *[TASS]* 16
Muslims Plan Pilgrimage To Mecca *[INTERFAX]* 16
New Ambassador to Libya Appointed *[TASS]* 17

Sub-Saharan Africa

U.S. Accused of 'Interference' in Ethiopia *[Moscow International]* 17
Downfall of Mengistu Regime Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 23 May]* 17
Diplomat Comments on Developments in Ethiopia *[INTERFAX]* 18
Ethiopian Rebels Said 'Displaying Friendliness' *[TASS]* 19
Three Maputo Mission Personnel Apparently Defect *[IZVESTIYA 29 May]* 19
Commentator Views Creation of Somaliland Republic *[Moscow International]* 19

East Europe

'Wave of Anti-Sovietism' in CSFR Continues *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 May]* 20
Romania Rebuts Criticism of Treaty With USSR *[IZVESTIYA 28 May]* 20

West Europe

PRAVDA Text of Gorbachev, Andreotti Remarks *[24 May]* 20
Further Reportage on Thatcher Visit 27
Activities on 28 May *[INTERFAX]* 27
Urging Gorbachev Invitation to G-7 *[INTERFAX]* 28
Meeting With Yazov *[TASS]* 28
Speech Addresses Soviet Economy *[PRAVDA 28 May]* 28
Meets Supreme Soviet Deputies *[TASS]* 29
Conservatives Threaten To Stop FRG Withdrawal *[Berlin ADN]* 30
IZVESTIYA Lauds British Cosmonaut *[28 May]* 30
USSR Supreme Soviet Committee Visits Sweden *[Moscow Radio]* 30
Soviet Delegation Meets Irish President *[TASS]* 30
CSCE Executives' Prague Meeting Reviewed *[INTERFAX]* 31

Latin America & Caribbean

Commentary Terms Pinochet Trip 'Insult' *[Moscow International]* 31

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Lukyanov Addresses Supreme Soviet on Union Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 33
Cites Gorbachev on Treaty *[TASS]* 33
Supreme Soviet Reviews Land Reform Progress *[TASS]* 34
All-Union Budget Deficit Exceeds Estimates *[TASS]* 34
Supreme Soviet Approves Credit for USSR Banks *[Moscow Radio]* 34
Republics' Nonpayment Criticized *[TASS]* 35
Deputies Debate Consumers' Rights Law *[IZVESTIYA 23 May]* 35
Proceedings of 27 May Session Reported *[Moscow TV]* 36
Pavlov Submits Foreign Investment Draft *[TASS]* 37
Deputies Debate Income Indexation Bill *[TASS]* 37
Resolution Requires Mandatory Enterprise Licensing *[TASS]* 38
Journalist Chastised for Insulting Deputies *[Radio Rossii]* 38

Political & Social

Cabinet Discusses Economic Issues *[TASS]* 38
CPSU Secretariat Discusses Rising Crime Rate *[TASS]* 39
Fight Against Economic Crime 'Protracted' *[Moscow TV]* 39
Constitutional Supervision Committee Meets *[TASS]* 40
Orlov Appointed USSR Control Chamber Head *[IZVESTIYA 24 May]* 40
CPSU Central Committee Secretaries Confer *[PRAVDA 25 May]* 40
Mafia Ready To Control 'Disintegrating' USSR *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 May]* 40
KGB Collegium Discusses Security Organs Law *[PRAVDA 25 May]* 41
Kryuchkov Interviewed on State Security Law *[PRAVDA 29 May]* 41

KGB Budget Unchanged Despite Extra Tasks *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 May]* 44
Shevardnadze, KGB Staffers Interviewed *[INTERFAX]* 44
Shevardnadze's Policy Group Set Up in Leningrad *[INTERFAX]* 47
Leaseholders, Entrepreneurs Congress Ends *[TASS]* 47
Popular Front Group Opposes Union Treaty *[INTERFAX]* 47
Journalists Accuse Media of Breaching Rights *[INTERFAX]* 47
Supreme Court Clarification on Media Defamation *[IZVESTIYA 24 May]* 47
Western Aid Useless Without Domestic Realism *[PRAVDA 25 May]* 48
Foreign Ministry Screens Film on Perestroyka *[PRAVDA 24 May]* 50
Sakharov Commemorative Congress Ends in Moscow *[TASS]* 50
TASS Reviews Press for 29 May 51

Economic

Draft Bill on Indexing Incomes Approved *[INTERFAX]* 52
Minimum Income Plan Under Consideration *[IZVESTIYA 23 May]* 52
Paper on Success of Joint Ventures *[TASS]* 52
Conoco To Produce Oil, Gas in USSR *[INTERFAX]* 52
Poll Shows Growing Pessimism Over Economy *[IZVESTIYA 25 May]* 53
Mir Cosmonauts Return to Earth 26 May 54
24 May Space Experiments Reported *[TASS]* 54
Descent Vehicle Lands in Kazakhstan *[TASS]* 54
Cosmonauts Give Briefing *[TASS]* 54
Gorbachev Awards Cosmonauts *[Moscow TV]* 55
Space Training Chief Criticizes British Sponsors *[Moscow Radio]* 55
Cosmos-2149 Launched by Soyuz Carrier 24 May *[TASS]* 55

Military

Yazov Speech at Afghan Veterans Conference *KRASNAYA SVEZDA 24 May[]* 56
NATO, WEU Expansion Talk Undermines CSCE *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 May]* 58
News Conference on KGB Border Troops *[INTERFAX]* 59

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Yeltsin Takes 'Active Stand' for Baltics *[Riga Radio]* 60
Russian TV Reviews Border Post Attacks *[Moscow TV]* 60
Pugo Says Border Post Attacks Justified *[BALTFAX]* 60
Savisaar Comments on Discussion With Pavlov *[Tallinn Radio]* 60
Estonia Said 'Willing To Buy' Independence *[Stockholm Radio]* 61
Lippmaa Resigns Over Narva Free Economic Zone *[Tallinn Radio]* 61
'Congress of Estonia' Holds Session *[Tallinn International]* 61
Soviet, Estonian Finance Ministers Reach Accord *[BALTFAX]* 62
Latvian Prosecutor Defends OMON Border Actions *[TASS]* 62
Reports of Troop Movements Discounted *[Riga Radio]* 62
'Alarming Events' in Baltics Reviewed *[Riga International]* 63
Lithuanians Urged 'Not To Yield to Provocations' *[BALTFAX]* 64
Landsbergis Criticizes Baltic Community *[BALTFAX]* 64

RSFSR

Fourth RSFSR Peoples Deputies Congress Viewed *[PRAVDA 28 May]* 64
Final Stages of Congress Reported *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 May]* 66
Yeltsin Visits Murmansk Navy, Civilian Units *[Moscow Radio]* 67
Visits Nuclear Cruiser Kirov *[INTERFAX]* 67
'Opposition to Nucleas Tests' Cited *[INTERFAX]* 68
Approves Economic Experiment *[TASS]* 68
Yeltsin's Election Mate Justifies Platform *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Ryzhkov: 'Military Reform Lags Behind' *[TASS]* 69

Addresses Voters in Krasnodar *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 May]* 69
Candidate Tuleyev Aims To Fight Criminal World *[Moscow TV]* 70
Supports Privatization, Union Treaty *[TASS]* 70
Interviewed With Bocharov *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 May]* 70
Bakatin Views Presidential Candidates *[Moscow TV]* 72
Silayev Discusses Presidential Election *[Radio Rossii]* 72
Interviewed on Economic Program *[Moscow TV]* 73
Khasbulatov: We Can Work With Gorbachev *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 24 May]* 74
Interviewed by NOVOYE VREMYA *[No 20]* 75
Vitaliy Doguzhiyev Chairs Tatar Commission Session *[TASS]* 78
Tatarstan Not To Participate in Election *[TASS]* 78

Western Republics

Belorussia Adopts Law on Entrepreneurship *[TASS]* 78
Belorussian Parliament Defers Anticrisis Program *[IZVESTIYA 28 May]* 79
Belorussian Official Stresses Foreign Cooperation *[Minsk Radio]* 79
Belorussian Budget Problems, Principles Outlined *[Minsk Radio]* 80
Ukraine's Kravchuk on Union Treaty Issues *[Kiev Radio]* 80
Ukrainian Constitution Debate Causes Rifts *[IZVESTIYA 24 May]* 81
Muravskiy Appointed Moldovan Prime Minister *[TASS]* 82

Caucasus

Armenian President on Independence Process *[Paris LE MONDE 26-27 May]* 83
Armenian Communist Leader Approves Border Talks *[TASS]* 84
Azerbaijan Lawmakers Discuss Normalizing Situation *[Moscow Radio]* 84
Azerbaijan Adopts Law on Economic Independence *[TASS]* 84
Military Steps Up Efforts in NKAO *[TASS]* 85
Georgian President Holds News Conference 28 May *[INTERFAX]* 85
USSR Accused of Supporting Ossetians *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 1 May]* 85

Central Asia

Gorbachev Arrives in Kazakhstan for Visit *[Moscow Radio]* 86
Hails Kokchetav Crowd *[Moscow TV]* 87
Visits Kazakhstan State Farm *[Moscow TV]* 87
Comments on Kazakhstan Successes *[Moscow TV]* 87

Gorbachev Spokesman Ignatenko Briefs Press

On Gorbachev-Thatcher Talks

LD2805152391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1359 GMT 28 May 91

[All news conference items by TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow 28 May (TASS)—The USSR is happy to receive a political figure who not only has an excellent understanding of global problems which face mankind today but also is able to define everyday problems constructively and precisely. This was stated today during a briefing by Vitaliy Ignatenko, aide to the USSR president and head of his press service, speaking about the visit to Moscow by former UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. She is here at the invitation of President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Briefing journalists about the content of yesterday's talk between Margaret Thatcher and the head of the Soviet state, Vitaliy Ignatenko reported that they spoke about the situation in the USSR and many other problems. The head of the press service also noted that the question of possible participation in the meeting of the "Seven" leaders of economically developed states coming up in London was also touched on.

Continuing the theme of the London meeting and the head of the Soviet state, Vitaliy Ignatenko reported that they spoke about the situation in the USSR and many other problems. The head of the press service added that the question of possible participation in the meeting of the "Seven" leaders of economically developed states coming up in London was also touched on.

Continuing the theme of the London meeting and replying to journalists' questions, Vitaliy Ignatenko stressed that there has never been a question of specific sums of aid from the "Seven" for the Soviet Union. At the same time, he said, any investments in the reforms being carried out in the Soviet Union would be a contribution "to the future of Europe and the future of the whole world."

On Gorbachev Visit to Scandinavia

LD2805161991 Moscow TASS in English 1426 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev will visit Norway and Sweden at the beginning of June, presidential spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko told a briefing here today.

He said Gorbachev will fly to Oslo on June 5 to attend a ceremony and deliver a lecture in the Nobel Committee.

He is also expected to meet Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland and King Harald V of Norway.

After laying wreaths at the national memorial and the monument to Soviet soldiers in the morning on June 6, Gorbachev will leave for Stockholm.

In Stockholm, he will talk with Swedish Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson and pay a visit to King Carl XXI Gustav.

Late on June 6, he will return to Moscow.

Commenting on forthcoming talks in Oslo and Stockholm, Ignatenko said they will focus on problems in northern Europe and Europe as a whole, as well as on economic relations between the USSR and Norway and Sweden.

'Very Meaningful Dialogue' With Bush

LD2805162991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1340 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 28 May (TASS)—Vitaliy Ignatenko, aide to the USSR president and head of his press service, reported at a briefing today on the telephone conversation late Monday evening between USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush. First, he called this conversation very "thorough and substantive," stressing that during it "topical problems" on arms reduction, economic relations between the USSR and the United States, as well as a summit meeting were touched upon.

Speaking about the possibility of holding a Soviet-American summit, Vitaliy Ignatenko, basing himself on the conversation, stated that "things are moving toward a summit being held." The "atmosphere" of yesterday's conversation, according to his assessment "can be qualified as one of inclination toward a summit." Both leaders voiced the view that the summit "is important and necessary for both countries," said Vitaliy Ignatenko, and "they agreed to continue to work in the spirit of mutual trust" characteristic of their relations. The date of the summit was not specifically discussed, said Vitaliy Ignatenko, replying to journalists' questions.

Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush, noted the aide to the USSR president, expressed satisfaction with the way Soviet-American relations are developing as a whole. In particular, they exchanged impressions on the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with U.S. experts who recently visited the USSR and studied the USSR's agricultural problems. The presidents gave "a positive assessment" of the work of the delegation of experts, of "their efforts, qualifications and conscientiousness," said Vitaliy Ignatenko, noting that this trip was deemed "constructive."

Vitaliy Ignatenko also said that it was acknowledged during the telephone conversation that the recent visit to Washington by Army General Moiseyev, chief of the general staff of the USSR Armed Forces had "gone well." The results of Mikhail Moiseyev's conversations in Washington will be summed up in Lisbon during the forthcoming trip by USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr

Bessmertnykh on 30 and 31 May and his meeting with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. "We are proceeding from the premise," the aide to the USSR president added, "that solutions on conventional weapons will be found in Lisbon."

Speaking about the Soviet foreign minister's trip to Lisbon, Vitaliy Ignatenko said that Aleksandr Bessmertnykh will be present at the signing of the document on the final establishment of peace in Angola. UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar will also be present along with Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and James Baker.

In the light of Soviet-U.S. contacts, the USSR president's aide dwelled on problems of a Middle East settlement. This topic has been raised regularly during contacts between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush and during the "important visit" to the Middle East by Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and his meetings there with James Baker, said Vitaliy Ignatenko. He said that these contacts have "given rise to real hope for the launching of a peaceful process of settlement, for a way out of the dead end in this chronic conflict, and hope for the convening of a peace conference." "We hope that the meeting in Lisbon will move the settlement of this important issue along further," the aide to the head of the Soviet state added.

Giving an evaluation of the telephone conversation between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush, Vitaliy Ignatenko said that the USSR president described it "as a very meaningful dialogue."

On Gorbachev's Visit to Kazakhstan

LD2805165891 Moscow TASS in English 1454 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Kazakhstan, which began today, is a "very businesslike" visit, which "completes the analysis" of the state of the country's agriculture and "the current stage of agricultural work in Kazakhstan," presidential spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko told a briefing here today.

Ignatenko said that following the visit it will be "very important" to "forecast the harvest expected in the region," which is one of the Soviet Union's main agricultural producers.

Asked about the reasons for the visit to Kazakhstan, Ignatenko said there had appeared a "small pause" in the president's agenda. At the same time, spring agricultural work had ended in Kazakhstan, and it was "necessary to forecast the harvest accurately and attentively."

Ignatenko said the Kazakhstan parliament decided to close the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site, and the centre has so far failed to react to this decision.

Addressing Gorbachev's position on the issue, Ignatenko confirmed that this is a "very important and alarming issue." Ignatenko said he expected that during the visit, "there will be time and reasons for discussing the issue seriously."

Estonian Money-for-Freedom Deal 'Not Right'

LD2805170891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1528 GMT 28 May 91

[Excerpt] Moscow, 28 May (TASS)—[passage omitted] Vitaliy Ignatenko was asked to comment on the utterances of Estonian leaders on the possibility of speeding up the process of Estonia's departure from the USSR in the event that the republic offered "compensation" to the Union in the amount of $1 billion.

In this connection, the aide to the USSR president stressed that in such a delicate matter as departure from the composition of the Soviet Union, "no kind of trading is appropriate." We are talking, he stressed, about the fate of millions of people, and therefore "any kind of reference to 'billions' is not right."

On DPRK Decision To Join UN

LD2805171591 Moscow TASS in English 1637 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—The Soviet Union can only welcome Pyongyang's decision to join the United Nations, Soviet presidential spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko told a briefing here today.

Commenting on the North Korean Foreign Ministry's statement circulated here on Tuesday, Ignatenko noted that North Korea's decision to join the U.N. is a sign of "common sense" on the part of the North Korean leadership.

The Soviet Union hopes that this move will promote the "inter- Korean dialogue" and security in the whole Asia-Pacific region.

Prospects for Western Economic Aid Examined

PM2405133791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Report by V. Nadein: "The Long Road to the 'Marshall Plan.' President Bush and Chancellor Kohl Discuss the Question of Aid for the USSR"]

[Text] Washington—The chief element of the meeting between the U.S. and German leaders was the discussion of coordinated Western strategy and tactics concerning the main dilemma of the present day: Whether to give the Soviet Union economic aid on a scale that will actually keep this major country from descending into chaos, or to stand by and watch the process of collapse, while dealing with its unpredictable consequences.

The first impression is that no answer was found to this question. However, the perfect harmony with which the two leaders talked of their confusion, their indecision, and the need to wait and see how events develop in the

USSR, gives grounds for close scrutiny of their arguments in the context of current events.

First and foremost, the leaders did not doubt the need to give aid to the Soviet Union. Without qualification—major, minor, modest, maximum. Just aid. When G. Bush was asked at his joint press conference with H. Kohl whether the German leader had advocated meeting the Soviet request for a $1.5 billion loan, the U.S. President replied:

"No, there was no specific request to that effect. I believe there was general agreement that we would like to be in a position to help the Soviet Union in every possible way. And we both expressed our confidence in President Gorbachev."

Kohl saw fit to interrupt and make his own comment at this point: "I would stress that we both fully agree that we must support Gorbachev. We are fully agreed on that."

But both leaders were equally in agreement when it came to doubts which H. Kohl expressed as follows: But would the Soviet Union gain anything from M. Gorbachev's participation in the London meeting of the "big seven"? The chancellor's answer to his own question was oblique: "President Gorbachev has a definite role to play, irrespective of whether he is present (in London)."

THE WASHINGTON POST cites an anonymous government official who said that one of the chief obstacles to the rendering of aid is the economic recession in the United States and the immense need for loans all over the place—from East Europe, where a number of countries have made significant strides toward a market economy; to Mexico, which is preparing to join the North American common market.

Other observers point out that the USSR is "not yet mature enough" to receive Western aid. Yet others perceive the difficulties that have arisen in connection with the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe as the main obstacle to diplomatic progress, which, in turn, would be the prelude to a "Marshall plan."

There has been an amazing glut of events these past few days.

In Cambridge, a group of young Soviet specialists headed by Grigoriy Yavlinskiy is conducting a scientific study in their U.S. colleagues' academic milieu.

A wide range of colleagues is represented. From Graham Allison, professor at the J.F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, who has been a nearly weekly visitor to the Soviet Union this year and views the prospects of our latest economic studies with faith and sympathy; to Marshall Goldman, associate director of the Russian Research Center at Harvard University, who believes that without the collapse of the Soviet Union its transition to a genuinely free economy is unlikely.

The Harvard study is hardly likely to enrich the project with unexpected finds. In the first place, G. Yavlinskiy himself, like his colleagues, is a world-class expert, as has been acknowledged more than once in the United States. In the second place (and this is perhaps the most important factor), no new discoveries are possible.

Jeffrey Sachs, professor at Harvard University, recently published a very persuasive article in THE WASHINGTON POST. It uses a multitude of facts and figures to show not only the vital need to give aid to the USSR, which, incidentally, is entirely in the West's interests. The article also provides the following calculations: The West is perfectly able to allocate $30 billion per year over the next five years—this period and this sum are considered sufficient to ensure the Soviet Union's full return to the world economy.

It should be added that Professor Sachs was one of the main advocates of the Polish model of transition to the market—he is not proposing anything fundamentally new for the Soviet model, nor is he intending to.

On Wednesday evening G. Yavlinskiy delivered a report in Cambridge on the measures that will be implemented in the Soviet Union in the immediate future. There is no doubt that the U.S. academics' conclusions will be carefully studied both in the headquarters of a multitude of companies and corporations, and in the White House.

The Soviet Union's willingness to accept fundamental economic innovations will not resolve matters entirely, however. It is a mandatory condition, but not the only one. Since the United States not only has its own helping hand, but is influential enough to be able to prevent, or at least to significantly impede aid from any other real source, it formulates its stance with brutal clarity: The Soviet Union must abandon its intention to transfer four army divisions to the marines and it must destroy all these divisions' heavy weapons, in tune with the spirit of the treaty concluded in Paris.

Observers believe that there will not be a war of nerves here—not a long one, anyway. Maybe the Soviet Union can achieve a compromise. But that takes time, and, as G. Yavlinskiy put it at Harvard, "the train is already at the station."

Americans are convinced that both our train and our armored train have to keep to life's schedule. They have no doubt that the Soviet delegation will have to concede on the question of the four divisions. If not this one, then the next one.

According to local commentators, the question is whether the concession will come in time. They draw up the following sequence. If the differences over the wording of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe are resolved, a treaty on strategic arms will also be ready for signing soon. The two treaties would make a Moscow summit realistic and necessary. The upcoming meeting, together with the law that has just been adopted on entering and leaving the USSR, opens the door to a

$1.5 billion loan and Most Favored status in trade. This status, together with radical changes in the Soviet economy, would lead to an invitation to M. Gorbachev to attend the "big seven" meeting in London. Which, in turn, would pave the way to large-scale aid—ideally, to a "Marshall plan" for the USSR.

These are local observers' scenarios. Persuasive though they may sound, life invariably resists attempts to confine it within a rigid schedule. The most important thing, however, is the unquestionable link between progress in getting our internal affairs organized and the improvement of the country's positions in the world.

Delegate at CSCE Talks Views Outcome

LD2505210191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0958 GMT 25 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vitaliy Yaroshevskiy]

[Text] Prague, 25 May (TASS)—A meeting of the committee of senior CSCE officials, which was set up by a decision of the Paris summit conference, ended late yesterday evening in the CSFR capital.

The main task of the Prague meeting was to prepare for the first sitting of the CSCE Council of Foreign Ministers in Berlin, the TASS correspondent was told by Yuriy Deryabin, head of the Soviet delegation and chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry's CSCE Administration. If one is to speak about the main results of our work, we managed to agree on the Council of Ministers' agenda, elaborate general approaches to issues at the Berlin meeting, and agree on the draft decisions that are to be adopted by the ministers. There was also a discussion of the negotiations on disarmament and security in Europe in 1992. These will be negotiations involving all 34 states on qualitatively new issues.

The participants of the meeting in Prague demonstrated a general wish to consider problems in the second Helsinki "basket" connected with the economy and ecology at the level of other key issues. This is connected with the fact that the principles of the market economy are recognized in Europe by practically all states, including the Soviet Union, Yu. Deryabin emphasized.

North Atlantic Assembly Ends, Concern Expressed

LD2605222591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1736 GMT 26May 91

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Kleshkov]

[Excerpts] Rotterdam, 26 May (TASS)—For the first time in postwar history the state flags of NATO member countries and of states that made up the Warsaw Pact military organization are flying in one row in front of the "De Doelen" concert hall in Rotterdam. The spring session of the North Atlantic Assembly, in which deputies of the parliaments of the USSR, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Romania were invited to take part, ended here today. The Soviet delegation was led by V.G. Kucherenko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of the Union's commission on budget, planning, and finance. [passage omitted]

What is worrying, noted V.N. Lobov, a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet's International Affairs Committee who spoke at the assembly session, is that in their speeches a number of Western parliamentarians divide the continent into western, eastern, and central Europe. Europe today should be regarded as a common home with unified security from the Atlantic to the Urals. The system of security should be built not on the basis of blocs but on the system of relationships between states which can be secured within the CSCE framework and with the active participation of the Soviet Union and the United States. [passage omitted]

Cocom Issues Reduced List of Restricted Products

PM2705144091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 May 91 Second Edition p 6

[PRAVDA-TASS report under the general heading "News in Brief"]

[Text] During a meeting in Paris representatives of the 17 member countries of the committee to control exports to socialist countries (Cocom) reached agreement on a new, very much reduced list of goods and technologies to be subject to highly strict controls "for reasons of Western security" in the event of their being exported to East Europe countries and the USSR. Controls will be lifted entirely on exports of a whole series of articles and technologies whose use no longer represents a "strategic threat" to the West, in the Cocom experts' opinion. In place of its former barriers, however, Cocom has adopted a new "prohibited list" including, in particular, state-of-the-art products from the electronics industry, new materials (carbon and polymer fibers), precision metal-working machine tools, TV communications equipment, lasers, and large computers.

United States & Canada

Report on Gorbachev-Bush Phone Conversation

LD2805205491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Telephone Discussion Between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush"]

[Text] A telephone discussion took place between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President G. Bush late in the evening of 27 May.

During their thorough and constructive conversation they discussed the most pressing questions of arms reduction and economic collaboration between the two countries, proceeding from the prospect of holding the planned summit meeting.

The USSR and U.S. Presidents expressed satisfaction with the work being carried out and their joint desire for its speediest successful conclusion.

Primakov, Shcherbakov Arrive for Talks

LD2905040291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1545 GMT 28 May 91

[By correspondent Andrey Fedyashin]

[Text] Washington, 28 May (TASS)—In line with an accord between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President G. Bush, academician Yevgeniy Primakov, member of the USSR Security Council, and Vladimir Shcherbakov, USSR first deputy prime minister, arrived in Washington today. They will meet with highly placed representatives of the U.S. Administration. On the agenda for the forthcoming discussions and consultations are questions of a possible expansion of economic cooperation and interaction between the USSR and the United States, and also with other developed indusrial countries in the West.

On Wednesday the representatives of the USSR president will have a meeting with Secretary of State J. Baker and will have contacts with M. Boskin, chairman of the economic council attached to the president. On Thursday there is expected to be a conversation with President Bush.

On 30 May there will be a meeting with the U.S. treasury secretary.

Scientists Offer Advice on Running Moscow

LD2805201691 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 2300 GMT 27 May 91

[Text] An intensive exchange of views began recently between Soviet economists and specialists of Harvard University about ways of the Soviet Union moving to a market economy and about the help of leading Western countries for the process. A group of Soviet experts led by an economist, Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, arrived on Monday in Boston at an invitation of Harvard University. They are discussing a draft joint economic program for the USSR.

Meanwhile, Moscow has just played host to a group of scientists from Harvard University who offered to the Moscow City Council a whole concrete privatization program for the capital city. The vice chairman of the council, Sergey Stankevich, told the American scientists that Moscow is ready to become a point of the breakthrough to market relations, complaining that the city is strongly tied up with the central and Russian Governments.

The newspaper NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, that covered the visit of the Americans to the Moscow City Council, underlined that the Harvard scientists, like thorough researchers that they are, carefully studied the structure of the executive and legislative agencies in the city. They came to a conclusion that the members of the Moscow council are too many in number and that the system of guidance is highly ineffective. In the opinion of the American scientists Moscow is a unique place to hold economic reforms in that its experience will never be repeated anywhere. However, they stressed that running the city effectively depends not only on the democratic election of executive and legislative bodies, but also on creating a good system of decision making. According to U.S. standards, the several hundred members of the city council should be reduced to not more than 40 to 50 deputies, who would be working as professional politicians.

The Americans also believe that Moscow needs what they call a strong mayor. In their opinion, the current chairman of the Moscow City Council has quite limited powers. He should have more powers and the city council should be chiefly given an advisory role. The American scientists quoted the positive experience of work by the strong mayors of New York, Philadelphia, Houston, San Francisco and Atlanta.

The Moscow newspaper NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA noted that the Harvard scientists do not want to impose their views, but only give advice on considering the offered ways to solve the problems. They are convinced that it is not the mayor of Moscow, Gavriil Popov, who should take care of how to feed the Muscovites, but the private sector in the city which is just beginning to be established. The Americans are sure that without an advanced private sector Moscow cannot have a normal, civilized structure of city government.

China

Journalists View Progress of Chinese Reforms

91UF0753A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 May 91 Second Edition p 5

[Article by PRAVDA journalists B. Avercheno, B. Barakhta, T. Yesilbayev, O. Losoto, and V. Lyubitskiy: "Man and Reform"]

[Text] Beijing-Moscow— **The more ancient a country, the more difficult it is for that country to change in order to keep up with the dynamic, impetuous stream of human progress. However, it is also correct to say that it needs renewal all the more, so that the burden of customary, age-old existence will not suppress the young offshoots from the mighty roots of the people.**

Reform in China in the last decade, about which a great deal has already been written in our press, is perceived by many people as miraculous, which is all the more surprising because to a majority our neighbor, though indisputably great, quite recently appeared too burdened with problems and traditions to suddenly find itself riding the wave of the times. Nonetheless, it is so. Everywhere they went in China, our delegation (see PRAVDA, 25 April 1991) heard legitimate pride taken in the pace and fruits of the reform. To be sure, there was no boasting, as if our interlocutors independently followed the instructive commandment of their ancestors: He is wise who is sad before the others and is joyous after the others...

Indeed, the reform in China, despite obvious successes, does not at all proceed without difficulty, as it brings with it a multitude of new realities and requires bold solutions. Understandably, it would have been futile to try to comprehend the entire complexity of this process in the short days of our travel in China. What we definitely wanted to discern and understand were the people in light of the reform: How do they live and get by, what changes are there around them and within them, and whether "perestroyka Chinese-style" is as painful to them as the current critical point in our history has turned out to be for us.

...The first thing that leapt out at us: It appears that when they embarked on this reform in China they altogether gave up their faith in the miraculous power of "leaps" which is, alas, a shortcoming of some of our domestic new-fangled politicians at present. To be sure, the people here did understand that time was short, and that catching up was not at all as prestigious as being "the vanguard." However, this prompted them to set course and calculate their energies all the more precisely. The main point is that they did not begin to demand "everything at once"—immediate prosperity and happiness for everyone. Thus, next to Guangzhou, the skyline of which is dominated by beautiful high-rises, construction workers themselves huddle in slums. When we were returning from Shengzhen, where the process in one of the shops of the Magneticoelectric Corporation Limited is automated to such a degree that only three people work per shift, we saw from the window of our train peasants walking behind oxen in their rice paddies knee-deep in water or, on the contrary, carrying buckets of water to dry beds on bamboo yokes. There is nothing that can be done about it: The difficult road to progress cannot be shortened by riding in a limousine behind someone's back; a lot of sweat needs to be spilled to acquire a "limousine."

It is another matter that care may be taken to make labor as efficient as possible. In this sense, the Shengzhen special economic zone has become an instructive example for the entire country. Referring to Shengzhen here, they invariably add "our window on the world." In the boondocks by Chinese standards, the town with a population of 20,000 has within 10 years turned into a powerful industrial center with 2 million inhabitants, with office and hotel skyscrapers, a high-speed highway leading to the international airport which is under construction, and services in all spheres of life developed in keeping with modern standards. A 100-fold increase in the number of tourists, from 70,000 to 7 million, testifies vividly to the attractiveness of the city.

However, this is not what makes it "a window on the world." The main point is industry in which new forms of ownership and organization of production, planning and material supply, capital investment and distribution of profits, employment and remunerations for labor are verified. Incidentally, wages here are twice as high as the average in the country. It is not surprising that people from other provinces flock here. It is through their labor that the manufacturing of more than 1,000 types of products has been set up, one-half of which are now exported to dozens of countries throughout the world: products of petrochemistry, machine building, metallurgy, construction materials, cosmetics, foodstuffs and beverages, fabrics and clothing...

Foreign investment is the first "peculiarity" of the special economic zone. It would appear that it would not make sense for foreign companies to invest funds in the Chinese economy and transfer the most advanced technologies there. To be sure, cheap labor is attractive but... why create future competitors through your own efforts?! It appears that the most distrustful of our strategists, who prefer "to proceed from our own resources" exclusively, reason approximately like this. As far as our neighbors are concerned, they have grasped the psychology of entrepreneurship in much greater depth. They judged very correctly that investors would not waste a profitable opportunity. As far as competition is concerned, the business community stopped fearing it long ago, perceiving it as a powerful catalyst for civilization. This is why Shengzhen indeed offers attractive opportunities to foreign investors:

—the tax on the profit of foreign companies here amounts to only 15 percent. Even this tax is repealed altogether in the first two years, and reduced by one-half in the subsequent three years, for enterprises of production sectors (industry, communications, transportation, agriculture, and forestry). Service enterprises are accordingly exempt from taxes in the first year of operation and given a 50 percent reduction in the subsequent two years;

—enterprises set up with the participation of foreign investors are exempt from local taxes;

—special preferences are given to enterprises with technologies meeting world standards. They are exempt from land-use fees for five years; customs duties on raw materials and equipment imported for production, as well as on all of their export products, are not collected. Allocations are given for the purchase with hard currency and on foreign-market terms of products produced inside the country by investors who introduce technologies that China particularly needs.

If we take into account quite a number of other preferences we will no longer find it surprising that, according to Li Hao, the mayor of Shengzhen, investment by foreign companies in the economy of the special economic zone has come to $5.5 billion, and the annual volume of exports of the products manufactured here is almost $2.8 billion.

Numbers aside, for a long time the apprehension which was developed in us for years kept us uneasy: Is the price paid for attaining world standards not too high? Putting it in the terms of our discussions among deputies or at rallies—is the country not being "sold piecemeal" in this manner? We found answers to this everywhere and in everything—in a 10-fold increase in the number of industrial enterprises on this comparatively small patch of Chinese land; in the fact that one-half of the products of these enterprises with modern equipment are truly a pure benefit for the population of the country—these products include furniture, clothing, tape recorders, TV sets, and prefabricated elements of residential buildings. The organization of production which is being perfected here (joint ownership, collective contracts, and a contractual hiring system) immediately find their way to other regions. In particular, Shengzhen itself already has more than 4,000 "joint" enterprises with various provinces of the country. There is one more indisputable advantage: The high standard of exports improves the prestige of Chinese brands all over the world. Finally, perhaps the main point which Shengzhen convinces you of: Previously, young people, attracted by the standard of living and prospects, were eager to go to Hong Kong, which is just a stone's throw away from here, whereas now the most active generation can see graphically that a worthy life can be had here, on their native land, as well; all that is necessary is to apply their talents and business energies, and not only in Shengzhen.

The neighboring city of Guangzhou is an example of another experimental avenue of the reform. This is one of 15 so-called economic development regions. In general, the objectives of both experiments and methods of production management based on economic independence are similar. However, there are differences. From an administrative point of view, Shengzhen reports directly to the center, whereas here, in Guangzhou, new economic relations develop under regular conditions and are included in municipal structures. In the former case, the comprehensive socioeconomic development of the zone is under way, whereas in the latter the main objective is precisely to develop industry, certainly, high-technology industry as well.

As Zhu, a member of the Guangzhou administrative committee, told us, foreign capital is also vigorously sought here: Investment from 14 countries has been made in two-thirds of the enterprises in operation or under construction. Unlike the special economic zone, these 120 enterprises employ the residents of the city itself—a total of 8,000 people; this is how high the technical standard of production is. As far as economic independence is concerned, these collectives enjoy no less of it.

In general, independence is one more real rather than proclaimed driving force of Chinese economic reform. Later, as we returned to Beijing, we were able to see that this was not at all the privilege of individual plants or regions; throughout the country, independence fundamentally changes the mentality of people and their attitude toward work, resulting in perceptible benefits to the state and, ultimately, to the working people.

For example, this is what a memorable conversation we had with Zhu Tanglin, executive director of the Yanlong company, was about. Having risen from a worker, and having first become "a king of metal processing" and subsequently a top-notch engineer, at the beginning of the reform he was appointed director of the Renmin Beijing People's Printing Equipment Plant. Like everything else at the time, the enterprise worked under a mandatory plan and manufactured only five types of equipment. A principle we are familiar with prevailed in production: Do "just this much," and nothing else will be required of you. However, everything changed after that. State requisitions for the output of the plant were reduced to 10 percent of its total value, and the rest of the products they had to sell on their own, whether on the domestic market or abroad. However, in the latter case they faced competition, which required the most up-to- date machinery. This gave an impetus to implementing new technologies; the retooling of production facilities became a necessity. Hence engineer and designer concepts became a priority, and incentives were provided for the high skills of workers. A technical school opened at the plant; mandatory training in production abroad was organized for the operators of imported equipment.

The time came, said Zhu Tanglin, when the efforts made and funds invested brought about worthy results. At present, the plant manufactures 45 types of printing equipment which use state-of-the- art technology with the best possible qualitative parameters.

The director was being restrained: "Well, no. Perhaps, we have so far reached the world standards of the mid-1980's. Therefore we still have a way to go..."

However, the facts speak for themselves. Products manufactured by the plant are already exported to 20 countries. At a 1989 international fair, 113 offset printing machines received very high marks, which made it possible to conclude a profitable transaction worth almost $20 million.

We must say that extensive economic independence has already ensured perceptible economic benefits for the state: After all, every contract signed by the plant guarantees that its tax payments will go up. Yearly gross output has increased six-fold under the reform, whereas the amount paid to the state last year also increased by a factor of six compared to that before the reform. At the same time, another ratio operates: Exceeding planned tax payments by one percent ensures the addition of 0.8 percent to the wage fund. Every year, the plant gives the state 20 percent more profits than planned; it is easy to calculate how the welfare of the people who generate these profits improves.

Income is the weightiest argument for everyone in favor or against all reforms. On one occasion we struck up a conversation with a fellow traveler, a young management specialist on a train between Shengzhen and Guangzhou.

He said: "A 50-installment series 'Hope' is now being shown on TV. This history of a family since the time of the cultural revolution rivets everybody to the screen in the evening; in essence, this is the destiny of the entire country. We watch, we recognize ourselves, and we wonder: Were we really able to live like that quite recently?! However, we did live like that... My mother and father had five children, and we had one coat for all. There was nothing on the table either..."

During the two hours of travel, girls in white aprons with carts or trays often passed through the cars, which were like our electric commuter trains, and offered the passengers hot rice with meat, soup, coffee, beer, sweets, travelers needs, newspapers, and souvenirs. This did not come as a surprise to anyone, except perhaps to those of us who are used to the homeless lack of comfort or even the dull discord on our commuter trains.

The reform has brought back pride of ownership to the people. These words, banal at first glance, do nothing but reflect a common truth here. This truth manifests itself most vividly in its "material" aspect at the markets. The people bring the fruits of their labor to the markets eagerly and generously everywhere—in Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou, and Shengzhen. There are entire piles of fresh-water pearls on strings, which tourists are so fond of, household utensils, clothing, footwear, and cosmetics. There is aisle after aisle of Chinese popular remedies which are mysterious to us—from lotus and ginseng fruits in every form to unfamiliar black balls about which we were only able to learn that they grow in the ground and are very useful.

Finally, there is the incredible abundance of food: bags with rice of a multitude of varieties, gifts of the sea from jellyfish to squid, all kinds of fruits and vegetables, the names of which we sometimes could not recall but which nonetheless were grown on real land by hard-working human hands rather than having appeared from an Oriental tale. The fact that our young interlocutor on the train referred to the hungrily empty table at home as a matter of the distant past is, of course, a credit to the Chinese peasants: They were the first ones to perceive the life-giving force of economic independence and responded to it with their entire hard-working inner selves.

We visited the village of Malu in the vicinity of Shanghai. The first point we noted in the narration of Fang Yangming, deputy chairman of the local people's government, is that there is little land here, but many people. There are 32,000 people, of whom 17,000 are working age, per slightly over 2,000 hectares of plowed land. Perhaps, the need to provide wages for all of them prompted the village to develop at the outset of the reform all forms of organizing production which our kolkhozes [collective farms] have also thought up in their time, but in a majority of cases the kolkhozes gave in to peremptory shouts from on high: Supposedly, only the land and the farm were their business, and everything else just a devilish commercial temptation. In our market-based times, a particular auxiliary industry would help our farms out greatly! Besides, our rural areas would not have become as depopulated as they have...

Actually, what is this about? About the fact that in densely populated Malu in the vicinity of Shanghai, 10 percent of the able- bodied populace work on the land continuously, growing grain and vegetables, and breeding cattle. Others go to the fields only at harvest time, and also when they feel like it, some on their days off, and some in the mornings and evenings. Their main workplaces are 124 medium-size and small rural enterprises, one of which (a joint enterprise with Japan!) manufactures medical preparations, and another 40 are joint enterprises with their native state, in which they own a share. The assortment of their products includes as many as 150 different products, one-third of which are exported to 40 countries.

We visited one of these enterprises: In the first shop they spin cotton thread, in the second they produce knitted fabrics from it, and in the third they sew excellent underwear from the fabric. In the fourth shop, silk fabrics delivered from the head plant in Shanghai turn into fashionable men's shirts in the hands of rural seamstresses. In addition, "auxiliary" enterprises of the village manufacture toys and rubber footwear, lights and baby carriages, even jacks and... refrigerators!

It is not surprising that profits from agriculture account for only 7.5 percent of the gross profits of Malu. At this point, our enforcers of the monosectoral isolation of rural areas will exclaim: You see, there is no interest of any kind; who is going to feed the country?

However, being aware of this, they did not take the path of bans in China but used economic levers once again. First of all, out of 22 million yuan which the village of Malu pays the state in taxes, the agricultural "shop" accounts for only 450,000 yuan. You would agree that this is a formidable barrier to those willing to achieve local welfare to the detriment of social interests. Second, the financial interests of peasants are taken into account after all: The state gave up the long-standing practice of

rigidly planning sown areas and the volume of sales of particular crops. Only limited state requisitions exist, and the farms themselves decide what to plant and how much. Hence the interest in, for example, increasing the yields of grains in order to free up areas for vegetable growing, which is more advantageous here. Third, every year 3 million yuan from the profits of industrial shops are transferred for the specific purpose of supporting agricultural production: mechanization, agricultural technology, selective breeding. The people know that the easier it is to get grain, the more hands will be freed up for more profitable labor. The results of such operations, devoid of control by officials, were mentioned by Li Ruihuan, member of the Standing Committee of the Communist Party of China Central Committee Politburo: Last year, an average of 400 kilograms of grain per capita were produced in China.

...Our memories immediately prompted us: Our rural areas grew 800 kilograms per capita in the last, bumper-crop, year, after all! However, the tones with which we speak about the food situations in our countries are very different...

In summation of the discussion of our perception of the reform in China, we cannot fail to address one more issue in which, for obvious reasons, we took an interest everywhere: What role do party committees and communists in general play in all of these changes? We ascertained everywhere that, having perceived the need for transformations, the party has remained a united and cohesive force implementing the set policy.

Tan Weiyang, chairman of the trade union committee at the joint automotive company Shanghai Volkswagen, stressed when we met: "Indeed, party committees do not interfere with production any more. Cadres capable of implementing the reform are their main concern. However, this does not at all mean that only communists may be appointed to managerial positions. Competency, a feel for things new, and the skill of uniting people in the process of work are the foremost requirements for the cadres. In addition, party committees, especially at joint enterprises, consider it their responsibility to defend the rights and interests of the working people, which ensures the socialist nature of the reform. The trade unions and the party stand together on this. For example, when the issue of switching to two- and subsequently three-shift operations arose at our plant, we made counterdemands on the management: Increase wages and improve the conditions of labor accordingly...

Later in Guangzhou, Wu Yangshen, vice manager of the petrochemical corporation producing detergents, stated the same thought more briefly, citing a slogan which is now popular in the party: "To turn management into servicing." In other words, the communists consider ensuring the best conditions for the success of the reform to be their task. They undoubtedly meet with support from society in accomplishing this.

...We ate our breakfast in Shengzhen for the last time in a rotating restaurant on the 53d floor of the tallest hotel there. A glass elevator moved us up along the outside wall of the building, and the landscape of a rapidly growing industrial city became broader with every floor.

As they write in guide books for tourists there, 10 years are but an instant in the history of China. However, this makes the fresh wind of renewal all the more perceptible, and the prospects opening up all the more appealing.

Diplomat on Signing of PRC Border Accord

OW2805223491 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 2200 GMT 23 May 91

[Interview with Sergey Razov by station reporter (Kalipov); from the "Hello, China" program]

[Text] The signing of the agreement governing the eastern part of the Sino-Soviet border was another success achieved at the recent summit meeting in Moscow. What is included in the agreement? What principle was followed when the two sides proceeded with their border talks? What sort of results can we expect to achieve in future talks? Sergey Razov, director of the Far Eastern and Indochinese Countries Administration under the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, discusses these issues during an interview with (Kalipov), a reporter from this station. Assessing the agreement prior to answering his questions, the Soviet diplomat comments on certain provisions of the agreement. He says:

The agreement is the result of Sino-Soviet border talks which resumed in February 1987. I would like to remind your listeners that previous Sino-Soviet border talks were conducted in 1964 and also during the 1969-1979 period, but no accords were ever reached, and no agreements were signed.

Razov says: An important accord was reached this time owing to the new situation as well as the friendly and comradely attitude and mutual understanding appearing in Sino-Soviet relations, and the fact that arguments presented by both sides were taken into consideration. The agreement signed in Moscow has defined the alignment of the Sino-Soviet border, starting from the intersection of the new Sino-Soviet border to the intersection of the Sino-Korean border. This section measures 4,300 km long.

The Soviet diplomat continues: It is pointed out in the accord that the national boundaries on the Amur and the Ussuri—or those parts of the border rivers opened to navigation—shall be demarcated along the main channels, and that the national boundaries on those parts of the border rivers which are not opened to navigation shall be demarcated along the middle of the main channels of these rivers. The provisions of this accord are based on internationally acknowledged norms. This document also includes an extraordinary provision, which stipulates that all types of ships can navigate freely to

and from the Amur and the Ussuri via Khabarovsk. This has actually gone on for some time, but it has been reflected in the accord. The two sides also agreed in Moscow to establish a boundary demarcation committee to proceed with the actual implementation of the accord.

The Soviet diplomat points out: This is also very important.

Answering the question raised by the Radio Moscow reporter about what principle the Soviet Union and China followed during their border talks, Razov says: This principle was expounded during the several stages of the talks, namely: The talks shall proceed on the basis of the original Sino-Soviet border treaties, taking into consideration the norms of international law, so that unresolved historical issues between the two countries can be settled fairly and rationally in the spirit of mutual understanding and mutual concession.

Razov points out: I think that the mutual understanding and agreement which both sides reached with regard to the principle of the talks have substantially and successfully expedited the progress of the talks. I think your listeners should pay attention to the other side of this issue: The full normalization of Sino-Soviet relations has significantly expedited the progress and success of the talks. This has once again explained the truth that friendship between states is helpful for settling the most subtle and complex issues.

Razov stresses: These issues were once considered impossible to solve in the past.

When asked how he feels the talks would proceed, and what sort of results we can expect in the near future, Director Razov says: The Soviet Union is deeply convinced that mutual understanding and the atmosphere of seeking solutions together during the talks will lead to the settlement of issues which have not yet been resolved. For example, constructive measures are to be taken to expedite the settlement of the western part of the Sino-Soviet boundary, which is very long. Owing to efforts exerted by both sides, preliminary results have been achieved in settling many unresolved issues of turning this controversial, tension-causing, and longest—7,500 km—land boundary in the world into a boundary of peace, mutual understanding, and good neighborliness.

Razov concludes: I believe that we can optimistically look forward to future negotiations. Because of both sides' mutual understanding, the alignment of the Sino-Soviet border will eventually be legally institutionalized by a treaty.

Commentary on Evolution of Chinese Relations

PM2905100191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 91 p 5

[Article by Candidate of Historical Sciences S. Goncharov: "Cautious Maneuvers by Worried Giants. How the World Situation Will Affect the Current Improvement in Sino-Soviet Relations"]

[Text] During the talks between M.S. Gorbachev and Jiang Zemin, the idea was frequently voiced that the new world order currently taking shape will bring with it new factors for instability, new problems. Above all Moscow and Beijing are extremely alarmed by the fact that their positions in their relations with the United States have clearly weakened. Gorbachev constantly emphasizes this idea when speaking of the danger of the USSR becoming a "third-rate power." After the Persian Gulf crisis Chinese analysts began to write with obvious alarm about the possibility of a "unipolar world" forming in which the United States would act as "world gendarme."

Soviet and Chinese influence in areas usually considered the two countries' traditional strategic province can be said to have slackened off. This process manifested itself for the USSR in the collapse of the Warsaw Pact. For China it was less clearly evinced and is linked above all with the strengthening of Japan, possible Korean unification, the future consolidation of ASEAN, and the probable inclusion in this movement of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. In this situation China and the Soviet Union are currently pursuing extremely similar policies. They are above all striving to ensure a "safety margin" in the event of a deterioration in relations with the United States by developing relations with their neighbors. China has begun to vigorously develop contacts with neighboring states following the tragedy on Tiananmen Square which caused abrupt coolness toward it by the West. Beijing has already achieved some success here and you now have the unprecedented situation where the PRC simultaneously has good relations with such "difficult" [slozhnyy] states—from its point of view—as the USSR, India, Vietnam, Indonesia, Japan, and North and South Korea.

Events in the Baltic created a similar situation for the USSR and the complication of dialogue with the United States forced it to establish relations with both its European and Asian neighbors. Previously, during the period of confrontation, the Soviet Union endeavored to open a "second front" for China in Asia, using its ties with Vietnam and India. China in turn tried to distract USSR forces away from Asia, encouraging the strengthening of Western European and NATO unity, along with the latter's tough positions toward Moscow. The situation has now changed radically, and the USSR and China now need one another in order to retain their influence in the world. Beijing does not oppose the development of Soviet contacts with Asian countries and is not trying to undermine Moscow's positions in Europe. The USSR is gradually dismantling the ring of "strategic encirclement" around China in the Asia-Pacific region and welcomes the development of ties between Beijing and the United States and European countries.

Let us look at the economic side of the two countries' regional policy. China is banking on joining in economic cooperation within the Asia-Pacific region. Apart from China's geographical and historical proximity to countries in the region, this choice is attributable to the fact

that the PRC's neighbors in Asia are not inclined to make human rights or the democratization of society the preliminary conditions for cooperation. The Soviet Union is still banking on contacts with G7. This cooperation is impossible without creating a common system of values, without human rights guarantees, and in-depth democratic reforms.

Thus, it is not only internal factors but also objectively different foreign policy priorities that determine the differences in the means of reform used in the USSR and the PRC. It is typical that the words in the Sino-Soviet communique stating the two leaders' commitment to socialist ideals are immediately followed by a statement pointing out that conditions in both states are extremely different and that the means of reform are therefore different.

USSR and PRC leaders are perfectly well aware that the United States and its allies are vitally interested in internal stability in the Soviet Union and China and, thus, in the predictability of their foreign policy. In this connection Moscow and Beijing have begun to use the idea of stability in their countries as a kind of lever for pressure on their Western partners. The joint communique also underlined this idea. At the same time China and the USSR warned that economic aid should not run hand in hand with political conditions.

During the talks the two countries' desire not to focus attention on the problems between them—particularly those on which China's positions are close to U.S. positions and differ from Soviet positions—was clearly reflected. It is interesting that the text of the communique totally fails to mention the Afghan conflict. Like the Europeans, the Chinese will hardly approve of the Soviet troop units withdrawn from Eastern Europe being stationed in areas east of the Urals. However, there was no mention of this during the talks.

So, the Soviet Union and China are to undertake quite complex maneuvers, including joint maneuvers to set their international affairs to rights. The USSR and China are striving to demonstrate the proximity of their relations and their own strategic significance, not to exacerbate confrontation with the United States but to ensure more favorable conditions for cooperation. It is also important that this rapprochement is not unbounded and will never, at any rate, end by reconstituting the alliance to combat imperialism.

Nevertheless even such limited and, in many respects, symbolic steps will not go unmarked, albeit due to the fact that there are limits to U.S. opportunities to individually determine the development of the situation in the world.

The current situation in Sino-Soviet relations confirms that the world has ceased to be bipolar centering on Soviet-U.S. confrontation. The independent interests of totally different forces, determined not so much by ideology as by far more practical (but also more rational) ideas of development and competition, are playing an increasing role in the global alignment.

In this world, rigid alliances in the name of revolutionary changes to the existing order are giving way to flexible partnership in the name of ensuring evolutionary development. Economic and scientific and technical might is becoming more important than military might and the superpowers' ability to run the planet's affairs is steadily declining, while their dependence on the positions of their allies and partners is increasing. The Soviet Union and China are at present displaying a desire and ability to play by these rules. No one will be any the worse for it if they can continue in the same spirit.

Chinese Trade Unionists Visit Moscow, Leningrad

91UF0777A Moscow TRUD in Russian 22 May 91 p 3

[Unattributed report: "The Visit of Chinese Trade Union Delegation"]

[Text] A delegation of All-China Federation of Trade Unions, headed by federation Deputy Chairman Yang Xingfu, arrived in the Soviet Union on a working visit at the invitation of the USSR General Confederation of Trade Unions. In addition to Moscow, the delegation will visit Leningrad; it will visit a number of industrial enterprises, learn about the activities of Soviet trade unions since their 19th congress, and about the efforts of trade organizations in the area of protecting the rights and interests of working people in the environment of a transition to a market economy.

On 21 May, the delegation met with V.P. Shcherbakov, chairman of the USSR General Confederation of Trade Unions. During the conversation, the parties exchanged detailed information on the activities of Soviet and Chinese trade unions and touched upon the issues of their future cooperation.

On the behalf of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions, the Chinese delegation presented a shipment of medications for the Soviet people suffering from the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station.

Northeast Asia

Impact of USSR-ROK Ties on DPRK Viewed

PM2805142591 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No. 18, 5 May 91 p 3

[Article by Vasiliy Mikheyev: "Between Two Subjects"]

[Text] The meeting between Presidents Mikhail Gorbachev and No Tae-u on Cheju Island was a logical and at the same time carefully calculated step. Naturally, before it was taken, the meeting's consequences for USSR-North Korean relations were weighed. The effect of Moscow's official recognition of Seoul was similar to a "dam burst" in that it provoked a frenetic upsurge in

bilateral links. The timing coincided with the liberalization of the Soviet press and this led to the simultaneous formation of a new image of North Korea in the USSR. Now the DPRK is seen as "one of the last bastions of Stalinism" and an active opponent of perestroyka and democratization.

In this situation a reasonable question arises: How, then, can we develop relations with the DPRK, with whom the USSR maintains a treaty of alliance and continues to offer military aid?

Our country's transition to a multiparty system has already resulted in the de facto dismantling of the old partocratic, ideologized basis of relations between Moscow and Pyongyang. The recent trip to Pyongyang by a delegation of Russian Communists led by Gennadiy Zyuganov, member of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee Politburo, was a nostalgic detail of little significance. These days, the "class character" of Soviet-North Korean "friendship" no longer prevents the USSR from conducting an independent political and economic policy in relations with South Korea. There is still a long way to go, however, before a new pragmatic basis is created.

Pyongyang continues to think in outdated stereotypes derived from a basis which no longer exists in our relations. This manifested itself with particular vehemence in the evaluations of the recent working visit to South Korea by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. The pages of NODONG SINMUN, the organ of the Korean Worker's Party Central Committee, issued the usual imprecations and accused the Soviet president of conducting "filthy and wretched diplomacy," committing a "criminal act," and exchanging "principles for dollars."

But perhaps the pragmatic pressure of life itself will have a stronger influence on the "Korean revolutionary" old guard or their young successors. At any rate, for their part it has to be mentioned—for the sake of objectivity—that the statement directed at the USSR on the pages of the all-powerful DPRK party press was not attributed to the official North Korean figures but was made in the name of the so-called "Hanminjon," which is based in Pyongyang and, more importantly, is the mythical South Korean Democratic Reunification Front. Meanwhile, Pyongyang shows that it is retaining an opportunity to maneuver and is not "burning its bridges" in its relations with Moscow.

These circumstantial allusions to pragmatism will soon stand serious trials. Seoul intends to join the United Nations in the fall, either simultaneously with Pyongyang or unilaterally if the DPRK persists with the "principled position" of not accepting the idea of "two Koreas." Up to now it has been the position of the USSR and China, who have the right of veto over the given question, which has blocked the South's entry into the UN. Today, however, echoes of a past "class partnership" cannot hinder this logical and sensible step—the Republic of Korea's entry into the UN—and Gorbachev agreed with this idea at the summit on Cheju Island. At the moment, Pyongyang has time to change its point of view and agree to simultaneous membership of the UN with the South. A highly propitious atmosphere is emerging for this now.

If, nevertheless, the DPRK refuses simultaneous UN membership, new nuances in Soviet-North Korean relations will emerge. Paradoxical though it may be, such a development of events could lead to the strengthening of pragmatic elements in our relations. The fact is that a unilateral application to the UN by Seoul coupled with a decline in Moscow-Pyongyang relations would above all complicate the position of the "lone" DPRK in talks with Japan and in inter-Korean dialogue: Tokyo and Seoul would become more confident and reliable but North Korea would have a narrower margin for maneuver. This would render the revival of Soviet-North Korean relations inevitable and in keeping with the interests of Pyongyang. But this can no longer occur on the old partocratic basis.

However, in this case the possibility arises for the activation of three-way relations mechanisms—Pyongyang-Moscow-Seoul. The Soviet Union, as the only major power to maintain diplomatic relations with the two Koreas, will get the opportunity to use its position to strengthen stability on the peninsula.

In this situation, rational and constructive ideas and initiatives seem the most effective retort to the imprecations and insults. It is important that we do not remain on the sidelines in anticipation of new developments in Korean subjects.

PRAVDA Reporter Views DPRK-Japan Talks

SK2905030291 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1200 GMT 27 May 91

[From "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] The third round of talks between the DPRK and Japan on the normalization of diplomatic relations were held recently in Beijing. No agreement on any of the specific issues was reached between their countries at the talks. (Sergey Zhonarov), correspondent of the PRAVDA in Pyongyang, sums up the talks as follows:

At the earlier rounds of talks held in Pyongyang and Tokyo, respectively, no agreement was reached between the two countries on the complete normalization of diplomatic relations. As a result, it seems that many people negatively predicted the outcome of the talks to be held in Beijing. The fact that the DPRK came to the talks without prior demands or conditions should be appraised positively.

With regard to pending issues, particularly compensation to be paid by Japan for the damages caused by its

occupation of Korea, Japan has not reached any agreement. On the other hand, the Korean side has failed to understand the conditions put forward by Tokyo with regard to the nuclear safeguard agreement and the dispatch of a team to inspect nuclear facilities on Korean territory. Pyongyang has refused to accept the Japanese demand, claiming that it does not have the capability to possess nuclear weapons.

Pyongyang asserts that the above issue should be discussed during direct talks with Washington since the United States has deployed nuclear weapons in the south of the Korean Peninsula.

Trying to change the process of the talks, Pyongyang proposed to discuss and give priority to the establishment of diplomatic ties. In addition, Pyongyang proposed that other issues be discussed at the next working level talks. However, it said that the Japanese delegation refused this, and thus it attempted to raise the issue directly with Tokyo, whose response was negative. The above article was reported by PRAVDA.

The Japanese side has pointed out that the complete normalization of diplomatic ties requires observance by international observers, and that Pyongyang's failure to talk to the International Atomic Energy Agency makes it impossible to establish ambassadorial-level diplomatic ties.

In light of the remarks by the head of the DPRK delegation, the third session of talks held in Beijing has further deteriorated the situation. The Japanese people have raised the issue of a Japanese woman who remained in North Korea by force. And, according to foreign reports, it has been learned during a trial held in a Seoul court that the Japanese woman who was involved with the explosion of the ROK airplane was trained as [word indistinct]. In November, 1987, a airplane with 115 people aboard exploded in the sky above Thailand. We do not know what the Japanese side hopes to obtain by raising such issues, however, many observers believe that the testimony by the terrorist is questionable and groundless.

At this point in time, when there has been no progress in the talks, it is difficult to find justification for the Japanese side's raising of the question. The Korean side said that it would not continue the talks until Japan withdraws the question and apologizes.

In conclusion, (Sergey Zhonarov) asks whether or not these talks are an attempt to settle relations, or just a sham.

Report on DPRK's Application to Join UN

SK2905025891 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1000 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] The DPRK has decided to enter the United Nations separately. A Foreign Ministry statement circulated by the Korean Central News Agency pointed out that this was an unavoidable step.

The statement said that the DPRK has always been opposed to two Koreas entering the United Nations, and that the North and South of Korea should occupy one seat at the United Nations. The decision by South Korea to enter the United Nations separately makes it inevitable for the DPRK to do the same.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentary on Search for Cease-Fire in Cambodia

BK2405074991 Moscow Radio Moscow in Cambodian 1200 GMT 23 May 91

[Commentary by Aleksey Nikolayev]

[Text] Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas again reaffirmed that a new meeting to normalize the situation in Cambodia will take place between 2 and 4 June in Jakarta. Our commentator, Aleksey Nikolayev, writes the following.

Altogether, 15 people will be attending the upcoming talks, among them 12 members of the Cambodian Supreme National Council who represent Phnom Penh and the opposing group, plus the representatives of Indonesia, France, and the UN Secretary General. It was not ruled out that Samdech Norodom Sihanouk will also take part in the talks. Be that as it may, as it has been reported, Samdech Sihanouk has expressed the desire to go to Jakarta.

The meeting of Cambodian parties is being organized at a time when in Cambodia itself, an agreement on a temporary cease-fire went into effect at the beginning of May. According to the statement by UN observers who recently visited Cambodia, in general, warring parties have observed the cease-fire. Will this cease-fire last? The Khmer Rouge, and now the other two opposing groups which have adopted the same stance as the Khmer Rouge, have categorically said that the last day of the cease-fire will mean the end of the talks in Jakarta.

The opposing Cambodian groups demand that the Phnom Penh government unconditionally accept the UN plan in Jakarta or they will threaten to renew military activities. The Khmer Rouge radio has stated: We will not allow Phnom Penh to alter the UN plan. Commenting on the situation in the country, Raoul Jennar, adviser to Western humanitarian organizations in Cambodia, considers the lack of mutual trust among Cambodian parties as the most important factor blocking the normalization of the situation. We can only agree with this.

One cannot help but stress Phnom Penh's legitimate suspicion toward the UN plan to normalize the situation. Phnom Penh has proposed to include in this plan factors to prevent the genocidal Pol Pot regime from usurping power in the country.

The Khmer Rouge replied by issuing an ultimatum. However, we should not yet be discouraged because Phnom

Penh's representatives to Jakarta have already said that Comrade Hun Sen recently revealed that the Phnom Penh representatives will put forward new proposals.

Observer Assesses Prospects for Jakarta Meeting

BK2505100791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Cambodian 1200 GMT 24 May 91

[Commentary by observer (Boris Durov)]

[Text] The Cambodian Government has proposed that the United States send a special mission to witness for itself the situation in Cambodia. Let the Americans come to our country. Let them crisscross the country and see for themselves what is happening. It was with these words that Comrade State of Cambodia's Prime Minister Hun Sen reacted to the statement by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker who affirmed the continued Vietnamese military presence in Cambodia. Here are comments by our observer, Comrade (Boris Durov).

This is the second invitation Phnom Penh has extended to the Washington administration. The first invitation was made two weeks ago when Richard Solomon, U.S. assistant secretary of state for Asian affairs, raised the issue, saying that Vietnamese troops are still in Cambodia. The second invitation was a reply to James Baker's statement, as we said earlier.

I have to note that Washington is taking the easiest way out. It continues to talk about Vietnamese troop presence in Cambodia but does not want to clearly discuss it to find out whether this is true or not. It just says it knows. Period. This kind of attitude is really very simple only in case the U.S. Government wants to delay a solution to the Cambodian problem. Otherwise, in my view, Washington would have accepted Comrade Hun Sen's invitation.

Listeners, please think about this. Suppose there are Vietnamese troops in Cambodia hindering national reconciliation. If the U.S. side is really serious about a solution, it would have immediately dispatched a special mission to Cambodia. Upon its arrival there, it will immediately see those Vietnamese troops and expose and denounce Phnom Penh. And Phnom Penh will certainly have no other way out than to admit that United States was right.

However, in Washington, let me repeat, there was no desire to go along in this direction. Why? The answer: There are no Vietnamese troops in Cambodia. Vietnamese troops have been absent from Cambodia since September 1989, nearly two years ago. The U.S. Administration was well aware of this.

It ought to be recalled that only recently a mission was involved in the search for the Vietnamese ghost in Cambodia. It was sent there by the UN secretary general. Included in that mission was a general from a genuinely neutral country, Ghana, and representatives from France and Indonesia. If they did find traces of Vietnamese troops, I believe that they would not have kept their mouths shut. However, traveling tirelessly in operational zones along Cambodia's western border, the UN mission did not find anything. It has acknowledged that the situation in Cambodia is nearly normal. It has also said that the voluntary cease-fire recently announced by the warring parties on 1 May has generally been respected.

However, this conclusion was ignored by Washington. In my view, this was deliberate. It is noted that, as the meeting among Cambodians—to be held in Jakarta in early June—approaches, the United States has made efforts to consolidate the position of two pro-Western opposing Cambodian groups it has been sympathizing with. In Washington, it is hoped that, Phnom Penh, finding it difficult to bear the charge, will be forced to disagree; and this would enable the opposing Cambodian side to come in and get a concession. If this is so, the United States is certainly taking steps to seriously attack the whole process to find a solution.

If this kind of situation arises at the Jakarta meeting, I predict that the Khmer Rouge will then have an excuse to spoil the negotiations, destroy the cease-fire, and pull back the peace process. And judging from recent statements by the Khmer Rouge, it is this kind of situation that they want to see, concludes our observer, Comrade (Boris Durov).

Near East & South Asia

PLO Envoy Discusses Middle East Peace Issues

LD2805165391 Moscow TASS in English 1536 GMT 28 May 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—"The Palestine Liberation Organisation supports the idea of convening a Middle East peace conference in keeping with the U.N. decision," Nabil 'Amr, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the USSR, said at a news conference here today

'Amr emphasised that the participation of the U.N. itself in the conference, including the permanent members of the Security Council and West European countries was of exceptional importance. Amr said Palestinians' involvement in the conference should be determined by the PLO.

On the situation on Israeli-occupied territories, 'Amr noted that the Palestinian people's uprising continued to gain momentum and produced important results. Nevertheless, the PLO was now taking efforts to rebuild bridges between the organisation and other countries, which were destroyed during the Gulf conflict and to this end maintained intensive contacts with Arab and West European countries.

He named among such steps reaching agreement between the PLO and Syria on joint efforts to solve the Middle East problem and the successful dialogue with France on this issue.

Characterising the situation in the Middle East as a whole, 'Amr expressed the view that a political vacuum had formed there and advancement in the Middle East settlement was suspended due to Israel's stance and also some negative aspects of U.S. actions in the Middle East.

Asked about cooperation between the PLO and the USSR, 'Amr said that the sides maintained regular contacts and exchanged information. He emphasised that the Soviet Union had ample opportunities for achieving success and positive results in a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

'Amr noted the importance of interaction between the USSR and the U.S. in the quest for a peace settlement of the conflict and expressed hope that it would produce positive results.

Commentary on Life, Death of Rajiv Gandhi

91UF0781A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 May 91 Union Edition p 4

[Article by V. Skosyrev under the rubric "Panorama of International Life: Our Friend Rajiv Gandhi"]

[Text] Not long before the death of Rajiv Gandhi I was in Tamil Nadu and participated in the placing of flower wreaths on the statue of his mother, Indira Gandhi. This traditional Indian ceremony also reflected the character of Rajiv Gandhi, who always saw himself not simply as a political leader but also as a continuer of the cause of his grandfather, the first prime minister of independent India, Jawaharlal Nehru, and his mother, Indira Gandhi, who was the head of state for almost 15 years.

Indira Gandhi's advisers testify that the elder of her two sons, Rajiv, had no political ambitions and shunned high posts. Born in 1944 in Bombay, he graduated from Dehra Dun College (India), studied at Cambridge University, and then had a successful career as a civil aviation pilot. Possibly his life would have been peaceful and happy if in 1980 his family duty had not forced him into politics. His younger brother Sanjay, the leader of the youth organization of the Indian National Congress Party and the likely successor to Indira Gandhi, died in his tiny aircraft.

Rajiv had to replace his brother. He became the general secretary of the party and was elected to parliament, but still he did not claim the leading role. And in 1984 the Nehru dynasty was touched by tragedy again. Conspirators from the guard shot Indira Gandhi. New Delhi was gripped by uprisings. The crowds killed Sikhs since representatives of this community had participated in the conspiracy.

At this most difficult moment Rajiv Gandhi was elected prime minister and with firm but resolute measures managed to calm the country down. The threat of anarchy was averted. After another two months Rajiv headed his party Congress (I) in the elections and achieved an unprecedented success.

At that time his opponents accused Rajiv Gandhi of coming to power "on the family ticket." But there is no doubt that the youngest prime minister in history enjoyed real popularity. The Indians were very impressed with his composure and sense of his own worth which he displayed in times of crisis.

Great hopes were placed on the political and socioeconomic program of Nehru's grandson. The country with the second largest population in the world needed stability above all. Rajiv acted without delay. Agreements were concluded for peaceful regulation with the moderate leaders of the Sikhs in Punjab.

His policy in the sphere of economic leadership also produced results. Many restrictions on foreign investments were removed and the rates of economic growth stabilized. In the international arena Rajiv Gandhi tried to eliminate the ancient disagreements with Pakistan. The agreement to refrain from attacking one another's nuclear facilities and to expand Indian- Pakistani contacts promised detente on the subcontinent.

While following in the footsteps of Indira Gandhi as one of the leaders of the nonaligned movement and improving relations with the United States, Rajiv Gandhi at the same time remained a confirmed advocate of cooperation with our country. It is no accident that one of the first documents of the new political thinking was the Declaration of the Principles of a World Free of Nuclear Arms and Violence signed in New Delhi by Rajiv Gandhi and M.S. Gorbachev. Rajiv Gandhi traveled to the Soviet Union many times and there is no doubt that he was the best-known and most respected Indian emissary here.

Unfortunately, his first successful steps to consolidate the state did not lead to the elimination of violence from political life. Terrorism broke out again in Punjab and Assam; the rebellion under the banners of Muslim fundamentalism became more widespread in Jammu and Kashmir. The programs directed toward modernization of industry and the introduction of high technology in no way improved the lot of the majority of the population.

Part of the "old guard" in the Congress (I) Party was also gripped with dissatisfaction. Party bosses complained that Rajiv did not consider the veterans and surrounded himself with a small group of young technocrats. There was a split in the Congress (I) Party. In the 1989 elections Rajiv Gandhi did not receive an absolute majority and was forced to make room for the opposition on the bench. But the coalition cabinets that followed one after another were not viable either.

And then there was a new challenge from fate—the early elections of 1991. Certain observers explained the failure two years before by the way the prime minister conducted his election campaign. Knowing about the terrorists' threats, he travelled mainly in helicopters and spoke from podiums that were protected by bulletproof glass. They said that this distanced him from the voters. It is difficult to say how important a role this factor played. In any case Rajiv Gandhi conducted this year's election battle, the last of his life, in an altogether different style. Accompanied by a small group of bodyguards, he went out among the crowds of supporters and tried to communicate with as many voters as possible. Possibly, the murderers took advantage of this.

Almost a half century ago J. Nehru characterized his activity this way: "Perhaps we have frequently acted stupidly from the standpoint of opportunist politics, but we have never forgotten that our main goal was to raise the overall standard of living of the people..."

Rajiv Gandhi undoubtedly remembered that precept. And it is not his fault that he did not manage to complete his work. An honorable state figure who was devoted to his country—it seems that this is how he will remain in our memory.

New Nepalese Prime Minister Seeks Better Ties

LD2905070891 Moscow TASS in English 0607 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Makarov]

[Text] Katmandu May 29 TASS—Nepal's new Prime Minister Prasad Koirala has said he will do his best to further relations between the Soviet Union and Nepal.

Secretary General of the Nepali Congress Party, Koirala, 66, was appointed to the post last Sunday after his party won the country's first democratic parliamentary elections in 32 years.

As a result of drastic reforms started by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, the USSR has embarked on a path of democratisation, Koirala said.

He noted that Nepal also believes in democracy, which helps promote mutual understanding and sympathy between both countries' peoples.

Koirala was expected to present a list of his cabinet members to King Birendra of Nepal on Tuesday. Koirala will head the ministries of defence, finance, foreign and palace affairs.

Political observers say that for two days, the country will live without the government, since the old cabinet resigned and the new one will be sworn in only on Wednesday.

In this situation, which is not envisaged by the Nepalese Constitution, the country's police and army have been placed on full alert. Law enforcement bodies fear that members of the left radical faction of the Nepalese Communist Party may provoke civil disobedience in the country. They said they would hold nationwide rallies in protest against arrests of Communist Party extremists.

USSR To Help Iran With Oil, Gas Prospecting

LD2905043191 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1900 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] The Soviet Union will help Iran prospect and tap oil and gas fields on the Iranian shelf of the Caspian Sea. Arzerbaijani specialists are already prospecting in the south of the sea where they hope to drill into oil.

Under the contract, thousands of square kilometers of the seabed are to be probed. Soviet space photography is to help.

Deputy Foreign Minister Meets Pakistani Diplomat

LD2905003891 Moscow TASS in English 1558 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev on Tuesday received Riyaz Mohammad Khan, director general of a Pakistani Foreign Ministry department, who arrived in Moscow for consultations on a political settlement in Afghanistan at the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

Rogachev and Khan expressed mutual interests in furthering a search for a peaceful settlement of the Afghan problem.

Khan said Pakistan is ready to take an active part in solving problems relating to freeing Soviet soldiers captured by the Afghan opposition.

Muslims Plan Pilgrimage To Mecca

OW2905040791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Last year a Soviet Muslim carrying out his pilgrimage to Mecca had to pay 5000 rubles on average to cover expenses. This year the trip to Saudi Arabia will cost 30,000 rubles, Abdulvahid Niyazov, coordinator of the Moscow Islamic Cultural Center told an IF [INTERFAX] reporter.

Only 140 people representing the Muslim community of the European part of the Soviet Union and Siberia will be able to make it to Mecca this year. Last year the number was 700. Altogether 1,500 Soviets travelled to Mecca last year.

The issue of this year's pilgrimage will be raised at a meeting of mufti Talgat Tadzhuddin, head of the Muslim Board of the European part of the USSR and Siberia, with representatives of Muslim organisations, to be held in the city of Ufa.

The suggested date of Soviet Muslims' departure for Saudi Arabia is between June 10 to 13.

New Ambassador to Libya Appointed

LD2805204791 Moscow TASS in English 1129 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev appointed Veniamin Popov extraordinary and plenipotentiary ambassador to the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah.

The new ambassador, born in 1942, Russian, graduated from the Moscow State Institute of International Relations. He is a candidate of science in history.

Popov has been in the diplomatic service since 1963. He worked in Soviet embassies in the United Arab Emirates, Syria, and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. From 1979-1986 he was head counsellor of the directorate for planning external affairs and of the directorate of assessments and planning of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Between 1986-1987 he attended courses for leading diplomats at the USSR Diplomatic Academy. From 1987-1990 he was Soviet ambassador to the Yemen Arab Republic. Since 1990 he has been ambassador to the Yemen Republic. Former Ambassador to Libya Pogos Akopov has retired.

Sub-Saharan Africa

U.S. Accused of 'Interference' in Ethiopia

LD2805135291 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 28 May 91

[Commentary by Aleksandr Pogodin]

[Text] It is difficult to say what is happening at the moment in Ethiopia proper and at the London talks between all the warring sides. Events follow one another so fast that any concrete analysis will inevitably lag behind the latest reports. Nevertheless, it is possible to make some general evaluation based on several obvious factors.

First, there's been a downfall of the totalitarian regime of the former President Mengistu Haile-Mariam, who did not look for ways to solve the conflict democratically. The government troops are demoralized, though by estimates of some experts, the civil army units are still capable of putting up resistance for a time.

Accordingly, the positions of the government delegation, led by Prime Minister Tesfaye Dinka, are very shaky at the talks in London and so the government cannot count on working out more or less acceptable conditions.

Secondly, the opposition forces are now ready to celebrate victory, with the main opposition force being the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front, but it is noted that serious differences have appeared among these forces in part as regards the setting up of a coalition interim government and about further paths of the struggle.

Thirdly, a direct effect is becoming more and more apparent on the developments in Ethiopia by the United States, which is acting as the middleman at the London talks. Until Monday the 27th, the United States warned the opposition forces against overrunning Addis Ababa, but its stand changed sharply on Monday and the American negotiator Herman Cohen calling on the armed units of the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front to enter the capital as quickly as possible. It was right after the call that the storming of Addis Ababa began.

It seems to me personally that in this case the borderline between mediation, which by itself means no bias, and interference has been crossed.

According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, Washington is ready to help set up a new government in Ethiopia and intends to restore its role there lost 20 years ago.

We can see that the factors affecting the overall situation in Ethiopia are rather contradictory. It is hard to say when the Ethiopian people, worn out by the 30 years of a civil war and by starvation, can embark on the path of peaceful, democratic development of their country.

The Soviet Union supports exactly such a choice, as it is not indifferent to the destiny of Ethiopia. It calls on all the sides to overcome hostilities and distrust as soon as possible.

Downfall of Mengistu Regime Assessed

91UF0780A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 May 91 Union Edition p 4

[Article by A. Nikanorov: "Resignation on the Anniversary: The Fall of the Last Pro-Marxist Regime in Africa"]

[Text] According to information sent by AFP from the capital of Kenya, there were 12 people in the plane. Mengistu refused to come out of the plane until Assefa Wolde, Ethiopia's ambassador to Kenya, met with him. We learned that the latter was at that time in Uganda. The plane was en route to Zimbabwe where the family of the former president was already staying at its estate.

The ASSOCIATED PRESS quoted the state radio in Addis Ababa that the president of the country "quit his post and left the country." The duties of the head of the government have been assigned to General Tesfaye Gebre-Kidan, vice president and member of the Ethiopian Council of State. According to REUTER, the radio information about the flight of President Mengistu Haile- Mariam was confirmed at a meeting with the ambassadors of a number of Western countries by Ethiopian Prime Minister Tesfaye Dinka.

Thus came the downfall of the regime of Mengistu Haile-Mariam. But the signs of the coming thunderstorm could be seen much earlier. As early as in March of this year the head of the government and of the ruling party

Somaliland can stand on its own, at least at the beginning. For the Somali population, however, the division of their country can only exacerbate the bitterness that already exists and the emergence of new problems. If there was a hope that talks would take place in July between the political forces in Somalia, that hope has now diminished. The USC, which rules in Mogadishu, has stated that it will not recognize the Somaliland separatists. Could this not serve as an example for opening up a new center of conflict? Even if it is said that there will be a quick solution to the existing political and social problems, would it not be difficult to advance the economic development of two different independent states?

In order not to get carried away, let me conclude my commentary objectively, says our expert. In view of Somali history, which is known for repeating itself, could the birth of the new Somaliland not be followed by the birth of the united republic of Somalia? Within the SNM and the broad society of the north, there exist influential political forces who oppose secession. At the same time, it should be taken into account that the SNM never officially refused to participate in any peace talks aimed at discussing the formation of a government in Somalia.

East Europe

'Wave of Anti-Sovietism' in CSFR Continues

PM2705125591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 May 91 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Monument Desecrated"]

[Text] Prague, 22 May—After the tank monument, Prague vandals have set after a new target—the memorial to Marshal I.S. Konev, commander of the First Ukrainian Front troops, who came to the aid of the Prague uprising in 1945.

The vandals painted in red at the base of the monument "What are you still doing here?" and signed themselves the Civil Liberty Movement.

The hooligan who painted the Smichov tank monument pink will, it seems, be pardoned without a trial. In addition to a specially created committee, this is even being requested of the CSFR president by Foreign Minister J. Dienstbier. Other officials—Federal Assembly deputies—are repeating acts of hooliganism. The wave of anti-Sovietism rolls on. Defamatory inscriptions have appeared on the apartment block housing employees of Soviet establishments in Prague.

Romania Rebuts Criticism of Treaty With USSR

PM2805143591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[Unattributed report from IZVESTIYA, RIA, TASS, POST-FACTUM, REUTER roundup: "Romania's Position"]

[Text] An official Romanian Foreign Ministry spokesman has said that the new Romanian-Soviet Treaty on Cooperation, Good-Neighborliness, and Friendship fully accords with the spirit of the Helsinki documents and the Paris Charter and can not be seen otherwise. The Hungarian foreign minister's statement casting doubt on this fact has no foundation. This is not the first statement by official Hungarian representatives, who, in particular, criticized Article 4 of the Romanian-Soviet treaty on mutual nonparticipation in alliances hostile to the other side. We think that this clause accords with the spirit of the Paris Charter since one can not speak of good-neighborliness between two countries when one party reserves the right to enter into alliances hostile to the other party.

West Europe

PRAVDA Text of Gorbachev, Andreotti Remarks

PM2405153791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 May 91 Second Edition pp 1, 4

[TASS report: "In the Name of Confidence and Cooperation. M.S. Gorbachev and G. Andreotti News Conference"]

[Text] As has already been reported, USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and Italian Prime Minister G. Andreotti have held a joint news conference. Opening the meeting with journalists, M.S. Gorbachev said:

We have just concluded our talks with Mr. G. Andreotti. They lasted four hours in total. They were very useful and important. Necessary, needed work has been done. Soviet-Italian relations have always been stable. We need constant meetings, talks, exchanges of opinions, and comparisons of views—all the more so in the turbulent and fast-moving times in which we live—in order to preserve this quality, achieve positive results, and reach a higher level of cooperation and confidence.

One way or another, we touched on all the main subjects which are currently at the center of world public attention and revealed a great coincidence, similarity, and proximity of views on most issues. This opens up new opportunities to pursue our cooperation.

I informed Mr. Andreotti about our internal affairs. I met with many of you here recently when President Mitterrand was in Moscow. But since then new events have occurred and new decisions have been made, and we discussed them. I am grateful to the Italian Government and people for the unchanged feelings of solidarity which they are showing in terms of political backing, economic cooperation, and plain human support for the immense work we are doing here.

We have found opportunities to expand our cooperation not only in the trade sphere but, above all, in implementing projects utilizing new forms of cooperation. Instructions have been given on this score.

We exchanged opinions on the questions of the current situation on the European Continent and concluded that it contains enormous opportunities which must be utilized. Cooperation in Europe must gather strength in all areas. At the same time, we stressed that this cooperation accords with the interest not only of the European peoples but of the entire world community. We exchanged opinions in great detail on the situation in the Near East—above all, on approaches to the resolution both of problems which have long been inherent in the region, and of problems which emerged as a result of the Persian [Gulf] crisis.

We touched on questions of disarmament. Mr. Andreotti showed interest in our expectations of the mission to Washington by the chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff. My reply was that we are hoping for progress.

On the whole, during Mr. Andreotti's current working visit I had a chance to see for myself yet again that in him I have an attractive partner and an experienced politician with whom it is possible and necessary to communicate and exchange opinions as often as possible. I express profound satisfaction with the results of the visit.

G. Andreotti: I share what President Gorbachev has said about the usefulness and constructiveness of our meeting. It is part of the line of cooperation and mutual trust between the Soviet Union and Italy—a line which found concrete expression a year ago during the signing of a whole series of documents, including an important treaty of friendship. This cooperation is developing on the whole both in interstate relations and during the contacts which our industrialists, traders, and men of commerce are currently pursuing with their Soviet colleagues.

The prospects opened up by new and existing Soviet legislation should be taken into account, as well as the draft laws which will be submitted for Supreme Soviet examination within the next few weeks. I am talking about the possible direct participation of Italian capital and Italian firms in the Soviet Union's economic development. This will increase our mutual contribution to the implementation of the "common home" concept, which has been the background to political development over the past few years.

We also had an opportunity to talk with President Gorbachev about the most urgent problems in the international situation. These included those connected with the consequences of the Gulf crisis and the Palestinian and Lebanese problems. These can now be viewed with greater optimism than in the past, since cooperation at the international level between the Soviet Union and the Western world—specifically, with the United States—has become markedly more active. We express the hope that a favorable climate will be restored for further arms reduction work, which has created the basis for overcoming the "cold war." Cooperation has proved its effectiveness in starting to resolve various crisis which had previously been nurtured precisely by the confrontation between the two opposing fronts.

We see a certain novelty in the rapprochement which has currently occurred between the Soviet Union and China and which deserves a very positive assessment. President Gorbachev told me about his recent talks with the CPC general secretary. Here too, it must be said, we are talking about a contribution—both direct and indirect—to improving the international situation. I think that there is a need for Soviet-Chinese cooperation, starting with cooperation within the UN framework and in world affairs as a whole.

President Gorbachev and I discussed the murder of former Indian Prime Minister Gandhi, stressing that it is necessary to oppose any manifestations of violence in the world and to educate future generations in a spirit of cooperation, making them aware of the need to work in a spirit of peaceful rivalry rather than strong-arm rivalry in all spheres.

We reaffirmed to President M.S. Gorbachev our committed support for the perestroyka policy, whose success accords not only with the Soviet Union's interests but the interests of everyone. We believe that, following this path, we need to build a system of international relations which will be able to avoid any repetition of the tragic mistakes of the past. Of course, many problems are now arising, but this is inevitable during the transition from an old system to a new system. I am convinced that nobody should feel any nostalgia for the past. The present Soviet leadership feels no such nostalgia, quite the reverse. It has a sense of great responsibility and of great pride, since it is engaged in creating an entirely different world both within the country and outside the Soviet Union. In this spirit we have been conducting our talks today first with the prime minister and later with President Gorbachev. I share the president's opinion that direct contact is very useful both for exchanging impressions and for more intensive joint work. [Andreotti ends]

M.S. Gorbachev and G. Andreotti then answered journalists' questions.

Questions from the newspaper LA STAMPA (Italy): Following these talks, how does the USSR president assess the problems, chances, and opportunities for his participation in the coming "Big Seven" meeting? And a question for Mr. Andreotti: Does Italy intend to participate in the plans for the conversion of the Soviet defense industry?

M.S. Gorbachev: The "G-7" subject did come up during our talks. We view it in the context of the development of international relations over the past few years. It is quite natural that these relations are being enriched with new forms of cooperation with every passing year. I attach great importance to the functioning of the institution that is the "G-7." Once, when its routine meeting was being held in Paris, I wrote a letter to President Mitterrand, and he read it out to the meeting participants. To my satisfaction the

letter was received attentively, and the problems raised in it were examined and discussed seriously and thoroughly. We maintain active bilateral contacts with all "G-7" countries. There is now a real need for the Soviet Union to have a chance to state its views at a "G-7" session. This idea has cropped up and is being discussed not only in the press but also in political circles. We have had a positive exchange of opinions on this subject today. I am optimistic about this.

G. Andreotti: The letter to President F. Mitterrand which President M.S. Gorbachev has just mentioned was exceptionally important. In the past we invited the Soviet Union in each of the "G-7" final communiques to cooperate in cooperation programs for the sake of third-world development. However, at the time, West and East actually had their own approaches to the problems of the South. But when a favorable dialogue began between East and West a chance appeared for new approaches. President M.S. Gorbachev's letter allowed us to get things moving. I believe that in the current situation it would be expedient to envisage contacts between the president and the "G-7" in connection with its annual meeting. This naturally depends on a decision made by not just one country but by all its participants. And, of course, I must treat with particular respect the role of Britain, which is in the chair on this occasion. However, I can state publicly that we are very favorably disposed toward the idea of Soviet participation in a "G-7" session.

We are currently experiencing a turning point in international affairs. We are examining the problems connected with the consequences of the Gulf crisis. We are also taking account of the existence of problems which logically require the necessity of cooperation with Soviet participation. Apart from general political problems, we can also talk about problems related to the environment. How can environmental protection measures be planned on a world scale without coordination with the Soviet Union? And another sphere—the fight against drugs—also requires a considerable contribution from and the support of the USSR.

As for the question of the prospects for cooperation in the sphere of the conversion of the military industry, this is part and parcel of the package of agreements signed during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Rome. A working group exists and is studying this problem. Here too we would like to serve as an example for the whole world. We are moving forward, and further impetus will be given to this progress by the exhibition which the Soviet Union and Italy are organizing in Bologna on the subject of the "Conversion of Military Industry." This is an active contribution we are making to the disarmament policy, since we know that there is a paradox that people working in the military industry are devoted to the idea of peace in their hearts but are scared of any reduction in arms production in case they lose their jobs.

Correspondent from the newspaper LA REPUBBLICA: Here are my questions: Mr. President, when will the meeting with G. Bush take place and will a date be set for it? Does it not strike you that relations between the USSR and West Europe are currently better that Soviet-U.S. relations? Mr. Andreotti, was the question of intensifying cooperation within the framework of the further development of the Paris CSCE agreement—including on a conflict prevention center—discussed?

M.S. Gorbachev: I think that, as regards political dialogue and cooperation within the framework of the Helsinki process, there is obviously a great degree of mutual understanding and extensive collaboration between the Soviet Union and the states of West Europe, and with the United States. And, by virtue of the definite weight which distinguishes and marks both the United States and the Soviet Union—not least as major military powers—the Soviet-U.S. dialogue is perhaps even more active in a number of cases. Above all as regards security, disarmament, the search for an approach to the restructuring of international relations, and their transition to a normal, healthy course. We are all working together in this area and, I hope, not without result. What is happening in the world and what we call the start of a new, long, and peaceful period in the development of human civilization are all our common achievement.

As for economic cooperation, there are certain differences here and not just between West Europe and the U.S. Administration. We have a different level and different forms of cooperation with certain West European countries too. If we are talking about Soviet-U.S. economic cooperation, I think that not everything has yet been done to ensure that these relations are normalized. There are still many obstacles which emerged during the "cold war" years.

As for the military sphere, we are currently well aware of who has what at their disposal. Moreover, I think that we are also basically aware of what certain countries will have at their disposal in the near future. And this allows us to say that we are, as it were, open to each other, there can be no surprises in this area. Nonetheless, the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls [Cocom] exists, and in a very rigid form. I think that a system of this kind is a relic of the "cold war" and nothing more. You will recall that I talked about the Soviet-French project to set up a transcontinental information system. When the project was signed, it suddenly transpired that Cocom had certain objections. Even here, strange as it may seem, Cocom found some dirty tricks, so to speak. Or take our relations with the United States, which have been weighed down by some—I will not say ultimatums—but preconditions. Once this could have been explained by the features of the historic situation, but now much has changed. But the conditions remain—particularly those which smack of a desire to interfere in our internal affairs. You know, if we go looking for each other's weak points and things that we do not like, we will always find some. But the idea is to recognize that each people is entitled to freedom of choice, to recognize our differences, and to recognize that these differences are not a source of confrontation but a source of contrast, competition, and, consequently,

progress too. Each people has its own culture and history, each country is at a certain stage of its economic development. And the differences will always remain. I see no tragedy in this, on the contrary—it stimulates an earnest study of each other. It is not worthwhile imposing our own models on each other, it is not worthwhile dictating. Let's learn new forms of cooperation which would accord with current realities and the current stage of the development of international relations. A very difficult transition is under way, and everything cannot be resolved at once. In the sphere of economic cooperation most obstacles still lie in the Soviet-U.S. area. This needs to be stated, it is a fact.

Regarding the date for a meeting between the Soviet and U.S. presidents, as I understand it—and our recent contacts, including my telephone conversation with President Bush show this—both sides want the meeting to be held. Probably everyone would like the meeting to be highly productive. Previously the topic or idea of some kind of interim meeting had emerged. Today we are nonetheless talking about a main meeting at which disarmament issues would be examined. And, in particular, we are aiming that before the meeting all questions will have been removed and the way paved toward ratification of a conventional arms treaty. And we could clear away or remove the last obstacles (they are not so substantive) in the way of a treaty on 50-percent cuts in nuclear strategic offensive weapons. That is why I have the impression from my last conversation with President Bush that there is a desire on the part of the Soviet and U.S. leadership to have this meeting. But since a number of questions still need to be resolved, we have clearly been unable to set a date ahead of time.

G. Andreotti: The reference to the all-European process is in itself the key to the resolution of this tripartite problem—the problem of relations between the Soviet Union, the United States, and West Europe. The all-European process marked the first turn in international politics. The Europeans, including the Soviet Union (with the exception, at the time, of Albania) fully agreed that the United States and Canada should participate in safeguarding security and cooperation in Europe. I recall criticism at the time which said: "How can Brezhnev sign such an agreement and at the same time talk about limited sovereignty?" We replied that Brezhnev will go, but the Helsinki principles will remain. And when the Helsinki spirit was triumphantly reaffirmed at the Paris conference and concretely embodied in the documents signed there, the granite foundations of all-European cooperation involving the United States and Canada were laid. Of course, it is impossible to rid ourselves of a certain legacy of the past in a single day; there are still problems which will have to be resolved gradually. Nonetheless, it seems to me that we can say that the new relations between the Soviet Union and the United States not only exist but have already led to substantive results. This morning President M.S. Gorbachev touched on the question of what might have been the consequences of the Gulf crisis and the occupation of Kuwait had there not been this new climate. The danger of World War III breaking out or of complications on a worldwide scale could indeed have been a reality. The fact that at the United Nations and within the Security Council framework the U.S. and Soviet positions are tending to converge marks not only the resurgence of the United Nations but rather the beginning of its constructive role.

De Michelis and I had a chance to meet with President Bush 10 days ago, and we can state that he had an obvious desire to have positive relations with the Soviet Union. The President told us that he is trying to remove the obstacles and legal difficulties in Congress with regard to the problem of credit for grain shipments.

When people get down to work with goodwill, all difficulties can be resolved.

For years we believed that agreements could not be concluded on medium-range missiles because of the impossibility of reaching agreement on verification, since at that time the Soviet Union saw any inspector as a potential spy. When the United States was trying to resolve the question of issuing visas to Soviet citizens, it seemed to them that it was a question of removing Adam's rib—but by no means to create Eve. But then the scientists got cracking. I remember how your scientist Velikhov visited us in Rome together with the Americans and the French. They then elaborated ways of verifying nuclear disarmament which were discussed at the Geneva meeting a few months later. It is important to provide a boost for cooperation. We want this spirit to be preserved and to grow stronger, because it has become a source of hope for us and led to a change in thinking worldwide. We are not specifically talking today about a conflict prevention center, but our entire meeting was held in the spirit of the further progress of the trend which sees the all-European process as one of the most important of all phenomena. We need to move in this direction.

Question: Were the problems of the Horn of Africa touched upon in the light of recent events?

G. Andreotti: In order to achieve reconciliation in the Horn of Africa region we and the Soviet Union, along with everyone else, have for a long period maintained contact aimed at finding the necessary solutions. This is a very complex region. If we look at the past, the parties in any conflict divided up on different sides, just like in old dances—some turned to the East, others to the West. They fought among themselves, and those who had turned to the East used weapons previously obtained from the West, and vice versa. Latterly major efforts have been made to ensure that liberation movements were able to express their aspirations without violating Ethiopia's state unity. We now express the hope that in the new situation following President Mengistu's departure, new circumstances capable of leading to a conclusion of the conflict will emerge. It seems to me that the

most extensive autonomy, to which Eritrea is undoubtedly entitled, should be implemented within the framework of a definite form of relations which would not harm the joint life of the country's citizens.

I would also like to mention the tragedy of destruction and death in a country adjacent to Ethiopia. In a country which is the poorest in Africa. The situation which has come about in that country—Somalia—is very complex. Tribal contradictions have reemerged there which had seemingly been overcome in the past. We will be using all our goodwill in order to help the Somalis, but, above all, they must help themselves and end their armed clashes.

M.S. Gorbachev: Let me add to what I have said that we fully agreed and realized that it is our countries which have a unique opportunity by virtue of the ties that developed previously to display good will and promote the quests for accord and peace on earth.

Correspondent from the newspaper LA REPUBBLICA (Italy): A question for the USSR president: Do you want to take part in the next "G-7" meeting? If so, what specifically do you expect from its member countries? Mr. Andreotti, what is your impression of the Soviet leadership's general state today: Is it worried or optimistic?

M.S. Gorbachev: I have already spoken about "G-7" and I won't repeat myself. We all have very many common concerns, after all. These include problems of security and disarmament, along with the problems of utilizing resources, the environment, and problems of helping regions with complex development conditions that are experiencing great difficulties. All this too prompts me to put forward the question of taking part in the "G-7" meeting. What we can talk about is the form this participation will take.

But I would also like to raise once more a topic that we recently examined in this hall, namely "perestroyka and 'G-7'." I am sure that the peoples of these seven countries, like the whole world, need perestroyka as much as the Soviet peoples do. Today the Soviet Union is, after all, one of the reliable, solid, constructive pillars of the world today. I am sure its role is simply indispensable. If this pillar disappeared, the consequences would be hard to calculate. The Soviet Union is too vast for anyone to be able to look with indifference on events there or maybe even rub their hands, saying: Let's see what is happening there and whether we can fish in troubled waters. I believe we are doomed to cooperate. Whatever position you take—strategic, military, or economic—all this is very serious. If it is possible to find 100 billion [currency unspecified] to cover the problem of a regional crisis, then I think that the question of cooperating with the Soviet Union so as to ensure that perestroyka happens and, as a result of profound reforms, the country opens up and turns to address man the individual, and also in view of the country's intrinsic orientation toward peace, this game is worth the candle. [Sentence as published. Vernacular: Yesli udayetsya nayti 100 mlrd. dlya togo, chtoby zakryt problemu regionalnogo krizisa, to vopros o sotrudnichestve s Sovetskim Soyuzom vo imya togo, chtoby sostoyalas perestroyka i strana v rezultate glubokikh reform otkrylas, povernulas k cheloveku i s uchetom eye vnutrenney napravlennosti k miru, to, dumayu, eta igra stoit svecha.] I think this is very important. We should exchange opinions about this at the meeting, if it takes place. Incidentally, the times suggest that this meeting is most desirable this year. I would like to hear suggestions at the meeting with the "G-7" leaders as to how we should best cooperate in order to help strengthen the positive tendencies that have emerged and are gaining momentum, and which we simply cannot sacrifice.

G. Andreotti: President Gorbachev told me how the internal situation is developing in the USSR and, in particular, about the steps now being taken to create the foundation for the renewed Union. The country is now in the transitional phase. There is also the future. I don't believe there are any grounds for pessimism, despite all the difficulties that these kinds of operations will inevitably produce. We must take care to ensure that everyone's actions and interests are as productive as possible and generate centripetal rather than the centrifugal tendencies that made themselves felt to a greater extent at one point. If we think about this in earnest, centrifugal tendencies are not in the interests of any part of the population now engaged in seeking a new equilibrium and new structures. I repeat, there are no grounds for pessimism.

Question: In your view, what are the prospects for rapidly resolving the problems on which the success of a future Soviet-U.S. meeting depends? How likely is it that Pope John Paul II will visit Moscow?

M.S. Gorbachev: The meetings we have mentioned here and about which we have spoken in detail with Mr. Andreotti are extremely desirable. But clearly it is necessary to meet one another halfway provided there is a mutual desire for this, after traversing a certain path and covering a certain amount of work. As for a meeting with U.S. President G. Bush, I can only repeat what I said before: We are working together—and, I hope, constructively. We are awaiting the results of the trip made by our chief of the General Staff. Essentially, one issue is outstanding. In my view, it does not affect the correlation of forces and does not disrupt the equilibrium. We must obviously find the correct interpretation and political elucidation of this issue and remove any misunderstanding. At any rate there is only one question; all the others have been resolved in one way or another on the basis of mutual cooperation.

As for a meeting within the "G-7" framework, it will take place since this regular institution operates on an annual basis and today it is the British authorities' turn to be the hosts. The "G-7" leaders should consult one another and exchange opinions on how the idea of the Soviet leadership's participation is to be effected, as Prime Minister Andreotti said. I welcome the positive statement he made on this question. At any rate I have already begin

to ponder what I would like to say at this meeting. If I'm not there, I will still say what I think is necessary.

Now a word about a papal visit to the USSR.

We have talked with Mr. Andreotti about the possibility of a visit by Pope John Paul II. We are satisfied with how our relations with the Vatican are developing. They are indeed developing in a fairly satisfactory way and have acquired definite momentum. I should even say that they are advancing so rapidly that we are not even having time to examine some questions, and some problems may be arising. We are trying to take note of them and examine them with his holiness' ambassador. At any rate I welcome the way in which our relations with the Vatican are developing. In this connection, when examining the prospects for these relations, we mentioned that the pope is to visit our country in line with an accord. I believe that we will choose the most appropriate moment together.

Question: Could you please explain the sides' positions on the question of a Near East settlement: In what respect are they close, and how do they differ?

G. Andreotti: As for Near East problems, I would say that we share common aims, including a desire to find a specific answer to the Palestinian people' legitimate political aspirations and to normalize the situation in Lebanon. In present circumstances there are a few more hopes than there were last year because we can see that the U.S. Administration is consistently cleaving to what G. Bush said at the United Nations 1 October. To whit, following the resolution of the Kuwaiti problem it is necessary to embark on resolving the problem of the Palestinians and Lebanon. Speaking more generally, we see that the administration is more sensitive to these problems than before. We also derive some optimism from the conviction that the Soviet Union's contribution is extremely beneficial as far as solving this problem is concerned. Both owing to the Soviet Union's relations with the Arab world and because the Soviet foreign minister has visited Israel for the first time. Conditions are emerging that can be said to have received a very high assessment on the U.S. side since they provide fresh opportunities to resolve the problem. The main thing is to start up the dialogue that hitherto has seemed impossible. And, naturally, we can arrive at a solution through dialogue.

Question: Don't you think, Mr. President and Mr. Prime Minister, that the current East-West rapprochement, or possibly an even greater rapprochement will increase misgivings among countries in the developing world? Won't this rapprochement occur at the expense of these countries' interests.

M.S. Gorbachev: I have frequently voiced my opinion on this subject in recent years. I believe that all developed countries in East or West, wherever they may be, must be aware of and realize their tremendous responsibility for what is happening in the developing world, where the peoples are experiencing great difficulties for certain historical reasons. I think that our civilization will be unable to make successful progress and harmonize international relations without resolving this key problem. If the gulf between developed and developing countries increases, the inflammable material that has already accumulated there may be more powerful than a nuclear explosion. The situation is very serious. During a conversation with a leader of a leading Western country I once said that, if you take the individual capitalist, he has long since realized: In order to advance production, technology and the introduction of scientific achievements are needed, along with a new kind of worker. He has to incur the expenditure involving in training this kind of worker. And he also has to spend a certain amount of money on the worker's family. He has realized this and is acting on this realization. As for the collective capitalist in the shape of the Western countries (I am repeating everything that I said then), he lacks this understanding as regards the Third World. This plundering (I said then) may go hand in hand with prosperity and enrichment in one part of the globe and the further impoverishment and increase in social and other ills in the developing countries. That is not normal. All developed countries, wherever they may be—East or West—must realize that it is a question of their common responsibility. It is a question of our civilization, which is very interdependent. I think that this realization is growing in developed countries' political circles. This subject is examined quite regularly and was also broached at the Paris "G-7" meeting, to which I sent a letter voicing my ideas on this problem. So, I think that realization of the world's interdependence and the fact that we must examine the development process at the same time as the disarmament process is intensifying today.

G. Andreotti: I would like to say that there are two concerns in Third World countries. One being that Europe, while securing greater harmony within the continent, will bother less about other countries' problems. The other concern is due to the fact that East-West rapprochement may to some extent harm rather than help Third World countries. As for the former I would like to say that the misgivings are in vain. We believe that failure would await all European countries if we ceased to interest ourselves in the problems of countries outside Europe in order to secure a just accord between us in the interests of building a common European home. As for the second aspect, one must consider that seats of crisis very frequently arose during the "cold war" not for objective reasons but merely as a reflection of the "cold war." Needless to say, East-West accord alone is not enough to bring the "whole world to peace." But the East-West accord makes a tremendous contribution to the common cause. I believe we should ultimately aim to achieve something mentioned by a Brazilian bishop: God did not create the First, the Second, or the Third World, God created a united world. And it must be united.

Question from the INTERFAX Agency: Mikhail Sergeyevich, do you now see a real threat to perestroyka,

and what future steps might you take and possible decrees might you issue to consolidate the transition to market structures?

Was the question of the crisis in Yugoslavia discussed during your talks and how, in your opinion, might the "Yugoslav factor" affect the development of the situation in Europe?

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Terekhov's question is quite a sound one. It is probably fostered by the feelings which, we sense, exist in society. These feelings are due to the fact that we have entered the phase of real, in-depth reforms that primarily affect our multiethnic state.

On Friday we will meet once again in the preparatory committee and will formulate the final version of the Union Treaty which is to be submitted for ratification to the republics' supreme soviets. This concerns everyone.

Over the last few weeks the anticrisis program has been discussed thoroughly in all spheres—in supreme soviets, by government bodies, trade unions, industrial associations, labor collectives, and in the press. Much alarm and many diametrically opposed viewpoints have been voiced in the course of this. On the one hand, it has been said that Pavlov's plan is a rehash of the previous programs, the previous government's programs. On the other hand the opinion has been voiced that the program put forward by Pavlov's cabinet is an antipeople, inhuman program. There have also been plenty of other things said. Our people have heard and experienced all this and are wondering: Where are we, what is happening to us? Naturally, political problems are also being discussed. Because the political reform is continuing.

Something else is also important: The realization has grown in society within the framework of the political process that private interests and group interests must now be pushed to one side and accord reached. It was based on this realization that the well-known statement—"Nine plus One"—that we have already mentioned emerged in society. There has been a great deal of debate over this: Who won, who lost, what is the meaning of this idea, what is the meaning of that. By and large we have reached the phase of the most profound and crucial changes, and the concern and clash of opinions are quite understandable. I believe that for the success of the policy of transformations, of reform, for the success of the perestroyka policy we must bear in mind at least three interconnected tasks. We need social accord. People now will not forgive politicians who produce slogans that stimulate instability and tension in society. They will, on the contrary, support those who find concrete ways of reaching agreement. That is the first and most important task.

Second. We must radically set about switching to new forms of economic life and resolutely move toward a mixed economy, toward the market. That is also necessary but, in order for this to occur, we must first stabilize our economic ties and overcome the slump in production. A whole series of measures is being adopted here. They form a separate section of the program. We must continue efforts to normalize the financial system and money circulation in the country, along with the consumer market. There will be no easy options here, either. So, there is accord and the continuation of the economic reforms—or, I would even say, their radicalization. For time is running short.

Third, we must do everything within the country to create in the immediate future the preconditions to expand cooperation with Western countries. So as to acquire new forms of cooperation with these countries. A great deal has to be done to achieve this. For instance, we have to ensure protection for foreign investments. I told Mr. Andreotti that V.S. Pavlov will deliver a report within the next few days, submitting the draft law on destatization to the Supreme Soviet. There will then be the draft of the antimonopoly law. That is a most pressing question for us. If we do not find the answer to how to combat supermonopolism in our economy, the market is doomed. There will also be a number of other measures later.

Everything that we are experiencing may create the feeling that something unexpected may erupt. But there is no way back. We will proceed with the transformations and must advance more successfully. On the other hand, I believe that we have achieved a pace that must not now be exceeded. We must not repeat with destatization and the transition to the market the situation we had with collectivization.

Now a brief word about the situation in Yugoslavia. Certainly we discussed this situation with Prime Minister Andreotti. Because we spoke of Europe, all the positive things that have been achieved here, and those points that arouse concern and alarm. Within the framework of this discussion we broached the situation in Yugoslavia. We express solidarity with the forces in that country that want to preserve this state which has made and is making a considerable contribution to resolving not only European problems but also world problems, in particular in view of its role within the nonaligned movement. That is why we voiced the hope that the current move toward a new quality of Yugoslav federation will end in success. This is close to our hearts because it is reminiscent of the processes under way in our country.

You know—and I also told Prime Minister Andreotti about this—that a centripetal process is emerging and broadening in our country. The meeting at which the anticrisis program was finalized was attended by representatives from all republics. Yes, all republics. Some of them asked to talk to me, and I did have conversations—albeit brief ones—with the representatives of Georgia, with the representatives of Armenia, with the representatives of Latvia, and with the representatives of Lithuania. Yesterday I was told that A.F. Ruutel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet, is requesting a meeting. In other words, there is already experience, there exist some realities which suggest the direction in which we should move. That is why I am sure

that although we are now experiencing a very acute period, society is coming to realize that we must preserve the integrity of a state which has taken shape over the course of one thousand years.

Correspondent of the newspaper EL SOL (Spain): Mr. Andreotti, have the contradictions been overcome as regards the interpretation of the conventional arms treaty?

And do you, Mr. Gorbachev, trust B. Yeltsin?

G. Andreotti: President Gorbachev has already said on two occasions that there are hopes that it will prove possible to overcome the last point of disagreement on the said treaty. I would like to add that it is our common desire that the dialogue on disarmament problems that changed the points of reference in international politics should once again acquire a lasting dynamic. We must restore the favorable climate, and as swiftly as possible resolve the problem of the interpretation of existing agreements and move on to the conclusion of new agreements.

M.S. Gorbachev: I will answer your question about trust... I think that I should first talk about responsibility. The current situation in society and the problems and tasks facing us insistently dictate that all politicians act in a certain way with regard to one another. I think that the emergence of the statement signed by nine republic leaders and the USSR president is precisely a result of the fact that this is understood. That is very important, since it is a question of major politics that affect the interests of millions, it is a question of a country that is undergoing profound changes. For all the diverse opinions on this statement, voices backing it nevertheless predominate in society. The main, overwhelming bulk of the population supports it. That is the first thing. Second, all the participants in this meeting—in one way or another and all the nuances notwithstanding—deemed it necessary to state their commitment to the general position and to say that they will abide by the demands and logic of this document. That will determine a great deal.

Since the Russian Federation's presidential election campaign is under way in our country and will soon enter the crucial phase, we will not interfere in the campaign and make advances toward any one candidate, leaving the others without. We wish them all success in the campaign. Let their programs vie with one another and let them show Russia's working people who among them is the more worthy.

Further Reportage on Thatcher Visit

Activities on 28 May

OW2905052391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 28 May 91

["A Sick Person Needs Pills, However Bitter—Margaret Thatcher"—"Diplomatic Panorama"]

[Text] Britain's ex-Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, continues her visit to Moscow.

Speaking at a briefing in the Soviet Foreign Ministry press-centre, Soviet presidential aide and head press staffer Vitaliy Ignatenko said that Thatcher had expressed the desire that Mikhail Gorbachev attend the meeting of the 7 in London as an observer. Ignatenko also noted that the ex-British premier had said she was willing to do her best to arrange for the Soviet President to get an invitation to attend the function. According to the President's aide, Thatcher notified Gorbachev of this in person in the course of their Monday meeting and reiterated the statement in her address to the USSR Supreme Soviet's internatioal affairs commission.

Her May 28 programme includes meetings and discussions in the Soviet Supreme Soviet's committees and commissions which, in the opinion of a Soviet Foreign Ministry official, are the Supreme Soviet's "qualitatively new bodies". Among the most important aspects of Mrs. Thatcher's visit are her talks with Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov and with Minister of Defence, Marshal Dmitriy Yazov. Tomorrow, May 29, Mrs. Thatcher will fly to Leningrad where she will be received by Chairman of the Lensoviet [as received], Anatoly Sobcheak. At Leningrad University she will meet with lecturers and students.

A diplomat told DP [Diplomatic Panorama] in connection with Mrs. Thatcher's meeting with Marshal Yazov that these talks had been arranged at the request of the British side. This diplomat did not specify whether the request had to do with the implementation of the agreement on conventional armed forces in Europe, but said that "the British side had no secret thoughts".

Margaret Thatcher is one of those political figures who closely follows the developments in the Soviet Union. Although in her opinion helping the Soviet Union will be a waste of money for the West, as the USSR has not raised its reforms to an adequate level, she still thinks that Mikhail Gorbachev and his team are on the right track. Addressing the lecturers and students of Moscow's State Institute of International Relations she put a special emphasis on the role of the Soviet president in making "colossal changes" in Soviet society.

Even though the Soviet people are facing enormous difficulties, they should not underestimate the scope of the reforms already carried out and of the tasks still to be accomplished, she said. A sick person must take pills. The pills may taste bitter and their effect may seem negative to the sick person. But if the treatment is correct, they will bring good results, she said.

Mrs. Thatcher said that the Soviet people would have to overcome a definite psychological barrier and that the past years had undermined their ability to work and think independently. Today, one should open the valve and let out the talents of the individuals who would not wait for state instructions and who would act on his own and bear the reponsibility for his moves.

At one time, Margaret Thatcher was one of the Western leaders who had advanced the idea of the Soviet Union's involvement in the work of the Big Seven. According to her concept, Moscow must be involved in the activity of this international mechanism. Mrs. Thatcher believes that without the Soviet Union the Seven, an organization which discusses global problems at its regular meetings, can no longer determine global tendencies.

Taking into account that Britain's ex-prime minister remains faithful to such an approach, one can presume that the possibility of adding one more member to the Seven was discussed during Mrs. Thatcher's unofficial talks in the Kremlin and in Novo-Ogaryovo on May 27.

The Foreign Ministry official who informed DP about this stressed that it was a private four-day visit on the invitation of the Soviet leaders. "What has taken place is not talks as such," he said, "but meetings and discussions, whose subjects were not officially defined." "The two persons involved in them were to freely raise the question which they found important to discuss," he said.

As to Britain's participation in the Moscow Conference on the Human Dimension, to be held next autumn, the decision will be taken by that country's government, the diplomat said. This does not mean, however, that Margaret Thatcher will not use her influence, given her long-time adherence to human rights and her deep knowledge of the Soviet Union. Judging from her speech at Moscow's State Institute of International Relations, she is convinced that deep changes in the sphere of human rights have occurred in the Soviet Union. A special role in this connection was played by the adoption by the Soviet Supreme Soviet of the Exit and Entry Law, which, in the diplomat's opinion, may help London decide whether or not to take part in the Moscow conference.

Urging Gorbachev Invitation to G-7

OW2905045791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 28 May 91

["Business Today"]

[Text] Great Britain's ex-Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher who is currently on a visit to Moscow said she was ready to get Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev invited as a guest to the big seven conference due to take place in London, said Soviet President's aide Vitali Ignatenko in Moscow on Tuesday.

Thatcher met in Moscow both with Presient Gorbachev and Soviet premier Valentin Pavlov.

The first time Gorbachev's participation was mentioned was in an address, signed by economist Grigori Yavlinsky, author of the well-known 500 Days programme and Academician Evgeni Primakov, a member of the USSR Security Council, to the 7 nations that contained a plea for large-scale economic aid to support the Soviet economic and political reforms.

Primakov who had arrived in Washington on May 27 on instructions from the Soviet president talked with U.S. presidential aides and chief White House staffers; discussion may have covered Gorbachev's possible participation in the meeting of the big seven.

Grigori Yavlisky who is developing, together with Harvard experts, a programme of western economic help to the Soviet Union is also in the USA. In case the programme is officially sanctioned, it could provide a major channel of aid to the Soviet Union.

In the course of a joint press-conference with Italy's Prime Minister Andreotti Gorbachev set the amount of aid the Soviet Union needs at $100 billion, but the President's staff later said that "the figure should not be taken literally".

Meeting With Yazov

LD2805170691 Moscow TASS in English 1529 GMT 28 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Oleg Moskovskiy and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov on Tuesday received former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

Thatcher is in the Soviet Union at the invitation of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Yazov and Thatcher had a thorough discussion of major international issues, the military and strategic situation in Europe and other issues of mutual interest.

In an interview with TASS after the meeting, Yazov expressed satisfaction with the discussion and voiced hope that the dialogue will "promote and develop mutual understanding and trust, which appeared between both countries when Margaret Thatcher held the post of British prime minister".

Since Thatcher is an active and influential politician, these contacts will have a positive influence on Soviet-British military cooperation and help resolve acute international problems and improve the political climate in Europe and in the world, Yazov said.

Speech Addresses Soviet Economy

PM2805134591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by A. Boldinyuk and S. Cheremin: "Margaret Thatcher's Lessons"]

[Text] "If you had run for prime minister in our government, many Soviet people would have approved that decision." These words were addressed to Margaret Thatcher, who addressed students and teachers of the

Moscow State Institute of International Relations yesterday. It is hard to imagine a higher assessment of the activity of a politician who was at the helm of her country for nearly 12 years.

Former British prime minister M. Thatcher arrived in the Soviet Union at the invitation of President Gorbachev. Although the trip's program is full to the limit—meetings with the country's leaders, a visit to Leningrad—Margaret Thatcher found the time to address the Moscow State Institute of International Relations. The institute's association of young journalists took an active part in organizing the meeting. Welcoming the honored guest, Moscow State Institute of International Relations rector A. Stepanov noted that M. Thatcher has in fact long been a teacher at that educational establishment: English language educational resources include recordings of the prime minister's speeches in parliament and television interviews. Actually, the experience of the outstanding state figure could be useful not only to students.

In a brief introductory speech M. Thatcher set forth her views of the changes which have taken place in our country in recent years. "Do not underestimate your achievements. What was inconceivable six or seven years ago has today become reality," she said. "You have achieved freedom of speech, assembly, and conscience and the opportunity to own land." But, M. Thatcher noted, the transition to economic freedom is far more complex. The main thing, in her opinion, is to provide citizens with the opportunity to engage in entrepreneurship and to restrict the interference of state organs in the economy. The former prime minister cited the following example: Last year, during a stay in Kiev, she was asked what her attitude would be toward the establishment of business relations between Ukrainian and British enterprises. "Such a question simply could not arise in our country since any firm has the right to trade with whoever it likes."

The numerous questions which the students put to M. Thatcher included the following: "Should the West now render financial aid to the Soviet Union?" "Until the bureaucratic system has been abolished, until reforms in the economy have been implemented, until the ruble becomes convertible, it is useless to invest money," the former prime minister believes. "Otherwise it will simply be spent in vain, as we have frequently become convinced when financing many projects in East Europe. You should also achieve legal stability, you cannot constantly change legislation."

Answering the question, will Soviet people ever be able to achieve as high a living standard as Britain, M. Thatcher recalled that there was a period of rapid economic growth in Russian history. At the end of the last century growth rates in Russia surpassed the European states' indicators. "The main asset is people, whose potential must be revealed. The sooner you free that creative energy, the more rapidly the desired level of prosperity will be achieved," Margaret Thatcher said.

All that remains is to be glad for the Moscow students who were able to hear answers to their questions from the mouth of such a well-known politician as Margaret Thatcher. Her lessons are worth heeding.

Meets Supreme Soviet Deputies

LD2805133791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1058 GMT 28 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow, 28 May (TASS)—Former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain said today that in her opinion the leaders of the "Seven" countries could invite USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev to their regular meeting in London in July. She was speaking today at a meeting with Soviet members of parliament in the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs.

Margaret Thatcher stressed that an invitation to Mikhail Gorbachev to attend the meeting of leaders of the "Seven" could facilitate implementation of economic reform in the USSR. In her words, Mikhail Gorbachev could be a guest of the meeting, an association participant, and could take part in discussions with the leaders of the "Seven," since meetings like this offer a host of opportunities for informal contact.

Margaret Thatcher declared that the West is ready to grant economic aid to the Soviet Union on the condition aid is used to carry out reforms, and not to maintain the old system. At the same time, she stressed that Western aid in carrying out reforms in the USSR is of far less significance than the USSR's own efforts, but it plays a certain role and will increase as the West becomes convinced the transition to democracy, market principles, and observance of human rights is irreversible.

Margaret Thatcher highly evaluated the reforms already implemented in the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe, and Mikhail Gorbachev's personal role in their initiative. She stressed that the difficulties the USSR is now encountering are primarily due to the fact that too much of the old system is preserved in the country, and many influential forces are resisting the transformations. It is especially important for the success of reform that its basic elements should be implemented simultaneously, since partial alterations will only distort the essence of what is intended, she said.

Touching upon the problem of achieving the sovereignty of the country's union republics, Margaret Thatcher pointed out that handover of power from the center to the republics is desirable in itself, but insufficient. In her opinion, it is essential to lessen the interference of state bodies in the activity of private individuals and enterprises at all levels.

She highly evaluated the new level of mutual understanding and cooperation achieved in relations between

the USSR and the world community. At the same time, Margaret Thatcher expressed concern over the situation in the Baltic republics, emphasizing that the West has never recognized the legality of their inclusion into the USSR, and fully backs the right to self-determination of the peoples of the Baltic republics.

Conservatives Threaten To Stop FRG Withdrawal

LD2905090491 Berlin ADN in German 0300 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—Right-wing members of the Russian military, the KGB, and nationalists demand not DM13 billion, as agreed in the treaty, but DM35 billion to finance the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Germany, the Berlin magazine EXTRA MAGAZIN reports in its latest edition. According to "Soyuz" Movement Chairman Colonel Viktor Alksnis, this figure is reached by adding the value of the barracks, exercise areas, and air bases that the troops will vacate. If Bonn does not want to pay, the military's archconservative members threaten to stop the withdrawal. According to EXTRA MAGAZIN, Viktor Alksnis, who is regarded by his opponents as a Pinochet of the East, believes there was a conspiracy against Honecker which brought about his fall. He demands a trial against former Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Aleksandr Yakovlev, formerly responsible for international affairs in the Politburo.

IZVESTIYA Lauds British Cosmonaut

PM2905093991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Krivopalov: "Applause in Honor of Helen Sharman"]

[Excerpts] London—The orbits of the earth made by the former British premier and the British woman who had just returned from space crossed in Moscow. M. Thatcher is visiting the Soviet capital. H. Sharman, who landed safely in Kazakhstan, is back at Star City again.

On board the orbital station Helen Sharman performed some difficult research work, showing that women—at any rate British women—can cope with the highly complex tasks as well as men. Congratulations from London have already winged their way to Moscow. Prime Minister J. Major expressed his delight at the safe completion of Helen's flight; Helen is her country's first cosmonaut. The Royal Aeronautical Society announced that she had been awarded a medal. [passage omitted]

Some commentators in London, while agreeing that Sunday 26 May was historic for Britain, could not refrain from gloomy statements. Thus, the lead article in THE DAILY TELEGRAPH, which is, incidentally, close to government circles, admitted: "This event (H. Sharman's flight—A.K.) causes some people regret at the collapse of the independent British space program, which was to have put the first Briton in space more than 25 years ago. It may indicate that many brilliant young scientists trained in our unversities should have sought work in America over the last 25 years because there was little demand for their talents at home."

Be that as it may, H. Sharman has ensured herself an honored place in British history—that of a nation of brave voyagers. Although she is of the generation born after Yu. Gagarin's space first, she is still a pioneer for the British and they can rightly be proud of her.

USSR Supreme Soviet Committee Visits Sweden

LD2905031291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1430 GMT 28 May 91

At the invitation of the Swedish parliament, a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for International Affairs, headed by Dzasokhov, chairman of the committee, politburo member, and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, arrived on a visit in Stockholm today. In the course of their stay in Sweden, they will meet Thago Peterson, head of the Swedish parliament. The Soviet deputies will familiarize themselves with the operation of the Swedish parliament and its foreign policy commission.

Soviet Delegation Meets Irish President

LD2905002191 Moscow TASS in English 2137 GMT 28 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Oleynik]

[Text] Dublin May 29 TASS—A delegation of Soviet parliamentarians on Tuesday met Irish Prime Minister Charles Haughey and Foreign Minister Gerald Collins, and talked with heads of the Irish parliament houses and leaders of political parties.

On Monday, the delegation was received by President Mary Robinson of Ireland.

The delegation is in Ireland at the invitation of the Irish parliament.

"We have come to Ireland, hoping to make another bridge of understanding between our countries," Yuriy Borodin, chairman of the Soviet parliament's Committee on People's Health Protection and head of the delegation, told TASS.

"People in Ireland are closely watching the development of the situation in the Soviet Union. We have close positions on the international arena. Ireland supports the Soviet Union's efforts in the United Nations and the idea to build a common European home, and welcomes the USSR's intention to join continental and world political, economic and financial institutions. It is ready to develop bilateral ties in economy culture and education," Borodin said.

He stressed that contacts with Irish law-makers are useful "We can and should use the experience of one of the oldest European parliaments," he said.

"I think that the consultations in Dublin created a good basis for developing inter-parliamentary contacts between our countries," Borodin said.

CSCE Executives' Prague Meeting Reviewed

OW2905050191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 28 May 91

["Will Berlin Meeting Cut a Window Into New Europe" by Pyotr Vasiliev, diplomatic correspondent—from "Diplomatic Panorama"]

[Text] Berlin will host on June [date indistinct] a sitting of the Council of CSCE Foreign Ministers, a new political consultative body set up last year in the course of the Paris sumit. The preparation for the Berlin forum was in the centre of attention of the CSCE senior executives comittee held in Prague on May 23 and 24. Also, Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh outlined some of his ideas on the score in a letter to his European counterparts.

Senior Soviet diplomat Yuriy Deryabin said that the Prague meeting had harmonized the agenda for the foreign minister meeting and the approaches to the issues on its agenda. The sitting also drafted the decisions the ministers of the 34 CSCE nations are to take in Berlin.

Yuriy Deryabin said major sets of issues relating to European construction would be discussed, including a blueprint for a future European architecture, the promotion of the CSCE process and its relation to other European structures, mechanisms and agencies: The EC, the European Council, NATO and some others. "We act on the assumption that the Helsinki process must continue to remain the principal instrument for the maintenance of stability and the development of cooperation on the continent," emphasized Deryabin.

According to the Soviet diplomat, the Berlin meeting will focus on security measures and the promotion of disarmament. "We assumed the initiative here in order to speed up the preparation of new disarmament and confidence-building measures talks in Europe. The Paris summit decided they should start after the Helsinki meeting in 1992." Deryabin noted that drasticallly new disarmament talks would be on the agenda: "Now we will have a single negotiating format with the participation of all the countries involved in the process, and two negotiating flows will come together." "Naturally, a new content, a new agenda will be at stake."

Deryabin denied that until the negotiations began, the NATO could become a prototype for a European collective security system. "We disagree with our western partners who believe that the NATO should increasingly assume the nature of a pillar of Eurpean security." The Soviet line is built on the assumption that the chief channel is CSCE, but in conjunction with all other agencies, he noted. Therefore, said Deryabin, "we intend to view NATO as an existing reality, to take account of the West Europeans' continuing need for a transatlantic link and the fact that the NATO is increasingly being transformed into a political organisation."

Furthermore, the Berlin meeting is expected to give a new boost to the development of economic, ecological and other European ties. Also, the Berlin meeting hopes to set up a mechanism for dealing with emergency situations, Deryabin said that "the nature of the European process calls now for rapid response". Some progress has already been made along this line, a human-dimension mechanism has been established within the CSCE format, plus a mechanism for an unusual military activity, an out-of-garrison military service. EC nations now press for a mechanism of response to emergency situations.

In its turn, the Soviet Union suggested that, firstly, a definition of an emergency situation is required and, secondly, there must be built-in guarantees to prevent the abuse of this mechanism. Thirdly, all possible decisions and recomendations should be passed by concensus. The Berlin meeting is expected to have another result: The creation of a mechanism for the peaceful settlement of disputes and conflicts. The nuances and details will be fine-tuned at the next sitting of the committee of senior executives in Berlin on June 17 and 18.

Latin America & Caribbean

Commentary Terms Pinochet Trip 'Insult'

PY2505165291 Moscow Radio Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 20 May 91

[Commentary by Gaston Vargas]

[Text] Former Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet has been received with repudiation during his travels, which Chilean official sources have described as institutional and private.

I believe it is not surprising to see what little support Pinochet has received and to see the political problems created in Brazil, Portugal, and England in a tour that was kept secret for security reasons. The name of the Chilean Army commander is associated with a dramatic period in Chilean history. His regime has been condemned several times by the United Nations and various sectors of the international community for human rights violations, for the deaths and disappearances of too many people, and for the violence used to impose a regime that was finally defeated by the democratic will of the Chilean people in a process that rallied international solidarity.

The various hostile reactions to the former dictator reveal that the international community continues to reject the antidemocratic methods implemented during

his regime. The conscience of the international community continues to be alert. There is suspicion in various sectors about the objectives of Pinochet's tour and about his contacts with arms companies.

(Jorge Faulkes), the official foreign policy spokesman for the Labor Party's so-called shadow cabinet, said Pinochet's tour puts people on the alert because a man who was responsible for the murder and torture of thousands of Chileans was allowed to travel abroad without any obstacles in order to become familiar with high technology materiel.

His tour is an insult to the memories of those who were murdered, who were tortured, and who have disappeared under unclear circumstances. Despite the fact that Pinochet used his trip to improve his image, the tour was not easy for him. France denied him a visa and South Africa withdrew its invitation. In other countries, such as England, Pinochet was only able to enter through the side door—without an official invitation and surrounded by secrecy and security measures that he is forced to adopt due to general repudiation.

This tour was undoubtedly degrading for Pinochet and the Chilean Army. The situation makes the demands of many Chilean sectors for Pinochet to leave his post more comprehensible and logical because his presence as Army commander is not only a threat to the country's democratic process and an affront to the victims of the dictatorship, but also a discredit to the Armed Forces, which should seek to recover their prestige in order to enjoy the people's respect and support.

Supreme Soviet

Lukyanov Addresses Supreme Soviet on Union Treaty

LD2705191391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1632 GMT 27 May 91

[Speech by USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A.I. Lukyanov at joint session of Supreme Soviet chambers in the Kremlin on 27 May; recorded—from the "Parliamentary Diary" program]

[Text] A session of the preparatory committee formed in accordance with the decisions of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies was held on 24 May. It sat for some time, more than eight hours. At the session, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet was one of the first to speak, and I gave a detailed report on what had been decided at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the [union] treaty. First and foremost, attention was drawn to the fact that the Supreme Soviet had expressed itself concerning the name of the treaty—the union treaty being best—and the need was once again stressed for the treaty to reflect as closely as possible the results of the referendum that was held on 17 March. In connection with this, a definition of the USSR was included in the treaty. Much attention was devoted to the issue of entities of the union, and here it was emphasized that it was sensible to divide these quesitons—the question of the founders of the union, on which all the republics, all our state formations should act, and the question of quotas according to which representation in the Supreme Soviet will be ensured.

Most of the comrades supported the proposal that the name of the Union should be registered and reflected so that our state is soviet in form. It was reaffirmed by the majority of comrades that it makes sense for one of the chambers of the Supreme Soviet to be called the Soviet Nationalities, and for the chambers to have equal rights. Many of the comments were examined in connection with the delineation of the competencies of the USSR and of the republics. Particular attention was given to issues such as the demarcation of authority in the power system and in fuel supplies, in the sphere of management of the defense industry, and in matters connected with the property of the USSR and of the republics and with the tax system. No final accord has been reached yet on a whole series of issues.

I would like to speak separately about the fact that Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov and I tried to argue in great detail that the union bodies and representatives of these union bodies, representative delegations of the union, should participate in the signing of the treaty. Here it was stressed that such a standpoint ensues not just from the fact that all peoples of the country have representatives in the Supreme Soviet and at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, but also because there is already a union in actual existence, its functions exist, and, very importantly, the international obligations of the USSR exist. Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov made a separate proposal, which we agreed on, to supplement the treaty with everything that has been suggested here concerning transitional resolutions, final resolutions which determine the continuity of work of the bodies of the USSR in the period after the treaty is concluded. Our resolution was commented on thus: This resolution is valid, and it clearly establishes that there is a need to bring the treaty into line with the results of the referendum.

As for the proposals by the USSR Supreme Soviet, these are being passed on for examination by the preparatory committee, and should be viewed in the context of all the proposals that have been submitted for examination by the committee. And I have to tell you that two republics have virtually submitted their own draft treaty drafted by experts. Ukraine has just presented its comments, quite big, extensive comments on the treaty. But whatever the case, unanimity was reached on a whole range of issues. In particular, it is particularly important that all particpants without exception stressed that the renewal of the union means a consolidation of federative principles, that this will be a federation of sovereign republics. This is exceptionally important, and all participants agreed with this provision that was put forward at the conference, and with the version of the treaty offered by Mikahil Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

The work will be continued, it is being put on a standing basis, so to speak. The draft treaty is being finalized, and in a week's time, the preparatory committee will meet again in order to discuss all the issues. I can only say that I will most resolutely implement and defend what the USSR Supreme Soviet has proposed during its session.

Cites Gorbachev on Treaty

LD2705125291 Moscow TASS in English 1104 GMT 27 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS—Lukyanov told parliament members that he talked with President Mikhail Gorbachev this afternoon about progress of work on a union treaty.

The president emphasised that Soviet people's choice at the March 17 referendum "is the major criterion, on the strength of which a new Union treaty should be elaborated", Lukyanov said.

The president said that "the people believe that the USSR should be a federation and that federation principles should imbue the entire treaty, all its sections, beginning with the name", Lukyanov said.

This also applies to delineating powers between republics and the union, the structure of federal agencies, citizenship issues, etc., he added.

Lukyanov stressed that "Mikhail Gorbachev regards this as the guiding impulse in elaborating the treaty in the drafting committee."

Supreme Soviet Reviews Land Reform Progress

LD2405193391 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 24 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow May 24 TASS—The two chambers of the Soviet parliament met in a joint session today to review the progress in the implementation of the fundamentals of legislation of the USSR and Soviet republics on law and land reform. Speakers at the session stressed the need to streamline the functioning of the land reform mechanism.

In his address to the session Minister of Agriculture and Provisions Vyacheslav Chernoyvanov stressed that the fundamentals of legislation on land adopted in 1990 provided a legal basis for land reform.

According to the fundamentals, the monopoly land use was scrapped and a multiform agrarian sector with equal conditions for different forms of economic management was established, the minister recalled. According to him, individual farming is now gaining momentum: 60,000 individual farmsteads have already been established with 1.5 million hectares of land at their disposal.

Chernoyvanov then said that land leasing is slow to develop because of the lack of a land use rent mechanism. He pointed out that reforms were braked by the erroneous withdrawal of land from effectively operating collective and state farms.

Aleksandr Nikonov, who spoke on behalf of the parliament's Committee for Agrarian Policy and Food, told the parliament that most peasants are in no hurry to lease land or organize their own farms. He referred to public opinion polls which disclosed that the reasons behind this reluctance to become independent include lack of confidence in political stability, lack of financial and material resources and the poor organisation of farm produce sales and material and technical supplies in the countryside.

Nikonov said that at least 200,000 or even 300,000 individual farms could be established, using up to 20 million hectares of land. "This, however, will amount to no more than a few per cent of the country's land fund," he said.

The parliament decided to adopt a resolution on the matter at the next session on Monday, May 27. The draft resolution envisages giving instructions to the cabinet to endorse within a month principles of land rent payment and begin to implement in 1992 a government programme to support individual farmers, subsidiary smallholding owners and agricultural cooperatives.

All-Union Budget Deficit Exceeds Estimates

LD2405140791 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT 24 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow May 24 TASS—The Soviet Parliament today received the final data on the fulfillment of the all-union budget in the first quarter of the current year, submitted by the State Committee on Statistics. The deficit of the union budget amounted to 27.1 billion roubles, increasing by 130 per cent as compared with a corresponding period last year. The deficit was planned not to exceed 5.8 billion roubles.

The deficit growth is explained by the fact that some republics, above all Kussia and the Ukraine, have not met obligations on deductions to the all-union budget, which were provided for by the inter-republican economic agreement for 1991.

Republican cabinet heads explained their failure to meet obligations by the shortage of funds in republican budgets due to the aggravated economic situation.

This year, the single budget of the country was divided into all- union and republican ones for the first time.

The lack of declared revenues made the government slash sharply budget outlays. Appropriations for the national economy amounted to 4.8 billion instead of the planned 8.8 billion, outlays for foreign economic activities—2.6 billion instead of 6.2 billion, defence expenditures—22.1 billion instead of 24.4 billion and for science—2.8 billion instead of 3.7 billion.

Supreme Soviet Approves Credit for USSR Banks

LD2705161991 Moscow All-Union Raido First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 27 May 91

[Excerpts] At the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Over to the correspondent's post in the Kremlin. At the microphone is Leonid Lazarevich:

[Lazarevich] Immediately after the break an unexpected question came up on the agenda, the question of giving credits of the Ministry of Finance worth $5 billion to the USSR banks for the stabilization fund.

What is this about? It is very complicated. It was explained here that many of the Union republics are not fulfilling their obligations in paying over their money into the fund. [passage omitted] Very little money is coming into the fund. So, in order that this money should get there somehow, the Ministry of Finance is borrowing these 5 billion rubles [as heard] from the State Bank. So you can imagine that this means that this credit will now be given. This decision was adopted by the Supreme Soviet, although the deputies spent quite a long and complex time discussing the subject. They were

worried about how far this credit was backed up. But representatives of the Ministry of Finance said that now, thanks to the fact that there is now some stabilization in relations between the Union and the republic, the republics are going halfway to meet the Union and are ready to pay over part of the money. [passage omitted]

Republics' Nonpayment Criticized

LD2705175791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1555 GMT 27 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 27 May (TASS)—TASS parliamentary correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Vladimir Isachenkov:

Today the union parliament endorsed the decision of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev on USSR State Bank credits for the Ministry of Finances in the sum of 5 billion rubles [R] at an annual ratio of six percent until the 1 October 1991.

These resources will be sent to the all-union extra-budgetary fund for stabilizing the economy, the formation of which is being wrecked because republics have not switched contributions to it in the amounts which were agreed earlier.

This fund was set up in accordance with the inter-republican economic agreement for 1991 to support sectors and individual enterprises which find themselves in a particularly difficult situation in conditions of transition to the market. It was proposed that the size of the fund this year should be R48.8 billion, including R12 billion in the first quarter.

However, as stated to deputies by USSR Finance Minister Vladimir Orlov, the Baltic republics have refused as a whole to make contributions to the fund, while other republics have reduced their contributions. As a result the situation on 1 May was that only R1.8 billion had come into the fund.

Vladimir Orlov reported that credit of R5 billion was offered to the Ministry of Finances by the State Bank for the first quarter; 3 billion of this were sent first and foremost to finance the most important construction projects of the fuel and energy complex. However, the time for using the grants expired on 1 April, and the bank refused to provide the remainder of the credit without the agreement of the president and the endorsement of his decision by parliament.

With the decision adopted today, the USSR Supreme Soviet has sanctioned the use of the remaining R2 billion and extended the period of time for using all the sum of credit.

Permanent financing of state expenditure by the banks has become the customary practice in recent years, and has led to uncontrolled growth in the budget deficit. Since the State Bank was removed from government control, in accordance with a law adopted last year, and came under the command of the country's Supreme Soviet, today's hearings set a precedent for the review in parliament of the question of the bank's credits for the Ministry of Finances.

During discussion, several deputies expressed doubts that the Finance Ministry will be able to repay the credit in the autumn. In reply Vladimir Orlov expressed the hope that the republics will fulfill more efficiently the obligations shouldered by them for contributions to the union budget and the stabilization fund, which will make it possible for the Finance Ministry to return the credit.

As is clear from data presented by the State Committee on Statistics, because of the non-fulfillment by republics of their obligations, the deficit of the union budget in the first quarter came to R27.1 billion, exceeding the planned level almost five-fold. USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov mentioned in April that the combined deficit of budgets at all levels this year may reach R200 billion. According to Viktor Gubarev, member of the parliamentary planning and budget commission, it may approach R200 billion.

Deputies Debate Consumers' Rights Law

PM2705084591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by parliamentary correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev: "One More Act of Social Protection"]

[Text] The participants at the 22 May morning sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet session began their work with a minute of silence: The members of the Union parliament honored the memory of R. Gandhi, who was assassinated the previous day in an act of terrorism. Many people in the hall, I. Laptev, presiding, said, knew the former Indian prime minister well. Expressing their condolences over the tragic event, the deputies at the same time sharply condemned the practice of political terrorism. The USSR Supreme Soviet will probably adopt a special resolution on this matter.

Moving on to discuss the main item scheduled for the day—the draft law on protecting consumers' rights—I. Laptev directed the deputies' attention to the fact that it is largely thanks to the persistence of the country's Supreme Soviet that the package of legislative acts dealing with social protection has begun to be introduced. The presidential Decree on the Minimum Consumer Budget was published 22 May. The committees and commissions of the Union parliament will discuss the draft law on the indexation of incomes 23 May. The draft law on protecting the rights of the consumer, which was approved on the first reading 27 February, is of the most important points in this package.

Deputy V. Petropavlovskiy briefed his colleagues on the results of the preparation of the draft law for its second reading. The largest number of amendments were made to Article 5 of the draft law, which deals with the right of all USSR citizens to a guaranteed level of consumption.

While they were finalizing this Article, V. Petropavlovskiy said, the deputies familiarized themselves with the government's outline of the minimum consumer budget.

The basic provisions of the outline are that on behalf of the whole of society the government is obliged to assume the role of guarantor in relation to all citizens in the consumer field. It is necessary to define in legislative terms the level of consumption that should be guaranteed to every citizen by society. In this case the state undertakes to maintain an adequate standard of living not for all members of society, but only for those who, for objective reasons, fall into the category of people who are unable to work.

All able-bodied members of society are guaranteed an income no lower than the minimum consumer budget. However, the remainder of the population has been conditionally divided into three groups: those who are no longer able to work, those who have not yet reached working age, and citizens in the care of the state. There is a differentiated approach to these groups. For the section of the population that is no longer able to work—invalids and pensioners—minimum pension amounts are being fixed at the local consumer budget level. In the case of those who have not yet reached working age—children and students—the state will be obliged to provide for them. For those in the care of the state—in hospitals or homes for the elderly—it is necessary to provide a consumption level commensurate with the size of the consumer minimum. In line with the outline of the minimum consumer budget, this is the upper limit of the consumption level toward which the state strives in its socioeconomic policy. From here it would be logical to define the lower level which in one way or another the state guarantees to each of its citizens. This approach, V. Petropavlovskiy stressed, was also incorporated into the new version of Article 5.

V. Petropavlovskiy also named the proposed date for bringing the law into force—1 January 1992. Time is needed to consider the new legislation involved in the conclusion of economic contracts and the establishment of economic ties.

Support for the draft law was also heard from the parliamentary Committee for the all-Union Consumer Market, and the Soviet of the Union Commission for Labor and Social Policy Questions. Criticism came from the Legislation Committee. The committee chairman, Deputy Yu. Kalmykov, indicated that in a number of places the document is inconsistent with the civil legislation draft fundamentals. In order to eliminate these it was decided to set up a conciliation commission. In Yu. Kalmykov's opinion, the inconsistencies are a consequence of the incorrect way in which laws are adopted by parliament. First of all the civil legislation fundamentals should be adopted.

Despite the keynote speaker's detailed explanation of Article 5 of the legislation, after the draft law had on the whole been adopted, the Article became the main topic of debate during a point-by-point discussion of the document. Many of the participants in the discussion were doubtful whether in practice it would be possible successfully to implement the guarantees declared in the Article. Far from everyone was convinced, even by the speech made by USSR Cabinet of Ministers Representative S. Kisilev, who made a statement about the unconditional guarantees on behalf of the government. The discussion lasted until the first recess.

Proceedings of 27 May Session Reported

LD2805002691

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 2040 GMT on 27 May, in its scheduled "USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program carries 60 minutes of recorded highlights from the 27 May USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 2040 GMT, USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov delivers a report on the Union treaty.

At 2048 GMT an unidentified deputy complains about coercive, Bolshevik methods being used. Lukyanov denies that Bolshevik methods are being used in regard to the treaty. Debates then continue. Another unidentified deputy raises a point concerning the treaty preparatory committee. Another deputy speaks about the issue of the name of the country. As this has been decided by the people, there should be a referendum to change the name of the country, says the deputy. Lukyanov agrees.

An unidentified deputy then discusses the issue of minorities, especially Volga Germans and Crimean Tatars. Lukyanov explains how minorities' interests are protected even if they do not have their own republic.

Next, a deputy says the new Union treaty means the collapse of the state. Another deputy says it should be put to the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. The same deputy who raised the minority issue complains that not a single Crimean Tatar took part in the treaty drafting. Another explains the situation. Lukyanov explains that Crimea is multinational.

An unidentified female deputy says that a committee is not enough to decide this question; it should be within the framework of the Constitution. Lukyanov says it is the decision of the congress and is binding. It is an agreement; there is no other way.

At 2114 GMT, Deputy Pavlov speaks about interim procedures and the need for a referendum. The people must decide. Lukyanov says it is a treaty. After approval by the republics, there will be another process, as in the previous treaty in 1922. First it has to be signed.

A deputy then raises the issue of voluntary proclamations of Union republics and the question of the Baltics. Lukyanov says he disagrees with the deputy's points. Another deputy talks about constitutional changes such

as appointing a president. He says a treaty will mean changes to the constitution. Some kind of emergency congress should be held. Then it will be done for the people. Otherwise it is like a coup d'etat. Lukyanov says that after the treaty has been completed, it will be decided how it is to be adopted. It means the anulling of constitutional provisions on the USSR.

At 2132 GMT the session is shown dealing with civil legislation. Kalmykov speaks about the work of the commissions. An announcer says he answered questions after his speech.

At 2136 GMT Lukyanov is shown opening the afternoon session. He says he spoke with the president of the USSR on the morning debate. The president stressed that the committee continues work. For the committee, the conclusions made in the referendum are a major criterion whereby the treaty will be brought to completion. The people think it should be a federation, and that the federation principle should permeate the treaty.

The announcer then says the deputies adopted by a majority of votes the basic civil legislation, except for section 5 of patents. Then they started an article-by-article debate. At the evening session they debated the question of ratification of the president's decision on granting banks and the Finance Ministry a 5 billion ruble loan for stabilization of the economy. Deputy Orlov spoke on this. After debate, the decision was ratified. Parliament's resolution was adopted on implementation of the legislation on land and land reform. Then the deputies continued examination of the draft on civil legislation, which should be completed on Wednesday, 29 May, at the joint session.

The announcer concludes by saying that on 28 May there will be another session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Pavlov Submits Foreign Investment Draft

LD2905102791 Moscow TASS in English 1015 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov said that the drawing of foreign investments into the Soviet economy is a strategic line and should promote the country's integration into the international community.

He today submitted to the Soviet parliament the draft fundamentals of legislation of the USSR and union republics on foreign investments, which will create a legal regime for foreign investors, matching world standards.

"Foreign investments could play an important role in the structural reorganisation of the Soviet economy and its demilitarisation," the prime minister stressed.

He said that 42 per cent of fixed industrial assets worth about 500 billion roubles need to be replaced. Equipment worth 50 billion roubles should be put out of production immediately. The annual volume of manufactured machines and equipment totals about 60 billion roubles.

Pavlov believes that direct private investments can give the country not only needed financial resources but also modern technology, intellectual potential and managerial experience.

They will give the USSR a greater leverage in world economic relations and promote a higher share of ready-made goods in the country's exports.

Under the bill, foreign investors will be granted no less favourable legal rights than Soviet enterprises or private entrepreneurs.

The document also provides for the protection of foreign investments from changes in legislation and nationalisation, as well as for guarantees to transfer profits in hard currency and to use profits in roubles. Guarantees are also provided if enterprises stop their operations.

Pavlov noted that the draft fundamentals provide the opportunity to set up enterprises with 100 per cent foreign investment.

The prime minister also said that the bill grants the right to enterprises with foreign investments to import and export without a licence and frees them from payment of customs duties on import and taxes on export.

The draft fundamentals also provide for the granting of concessions to foreign investors to develop natural resources and contains general provisions on free economic zones.

Deputies Debate Income Indexation Bill

LD2805135891 Moscow TASS in English 1309 GMT 28 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—The Soviet parliament today debated and approved the first reading of draft fundamentals of legislation on income indexation.

Representing the bill, the minister for labour and social issues, Valeriy Paulman, said it aims to "lay uniform organisational, legal and economic groundwork for indexing the population's monetary incomes on Soviet territory".

Indexation is to be carried out every three months based on the consumer price index. It will cover pensions, social benefits, scholarships and wages and salaries at government organisations and enterprises.

"The cabinet believes that the pay of other workers should not be raised automatically but only as they increase productivity, improve job quality and boost

output," Paulman said. "Extending income indexation to cover all workers will only spur inflation time and again," he explained.

Paulman said the republics will set ceilings on income indexation and decide other related issues.

Indexation will take into account both government and market prices, since even today more than 40 percent of goods in retail trade are sold at free or negotiated prices.

According to the Ministry for Labour and Social Issues, every time the price index grows by one percent, 3.55 billion roubles will be needed nationwide to make up for the increase.

Several deputies criticised the bill. Aleksandr Zhuravlev, deputy chairman of the parliamentary commission on labour and social policies, expressed doubt about whether income indexation alone can maintain high living standards against the background of rising inflation expected this year. "We need a general wage reform and indexation should be part of it," he said.

Others noted the difficulty of finding money to finance the indexation scheme.

After a review in parliamentary committees, the bill is expected to face a second reading late next month.

Resolution Requires Mandatory Enterprise Licensing

LD2805194391 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 28 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—The Soviet parliament on Tuesday adopted a resolution banning a free sale of several types of industrial products and industrial wastes, and introducing obligatory state licensing for corresponding industrial activities.

Licenses will be issued by the recently set up Soviet fund of State Property.

Deputy Soviet Prime Minister Yuriy Maslyukov said the measure aims at activities "which deal with the country's defence potential, state and public security, the environment and people's health".

In accordance with a draft Union treaty, these activities will come within the jurisdiction of the Soviet Union, he said.

The resolution bans a free sale of precious and rare earth metals, strategic materials, weapons and military hardware, radioactive substances and their wastes, as well as other products.

Enterprises, which do not have a special license, cannot develop, manufacture and sell weapons, military hardware and spare parts for it, extract, produce, transport, process, bury and sell uranium and other fissionable materials, as well as extract, refine and sell oil and gas.

Enterprises also need a licence to mediate foreign economic deals, design, build and use national transport, communications and information systems, produce power at power plants with a capacity over 500 kilowatts, as well as to carry out some other economic activities.

Maslyukov believes that licences should be sold and will be valid for five yers.

Each union republic will determine additional industrial activities subject to licensing, proceeding from local conditions.

Journalist Chastised for Insulting Deputies

LD2805152691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 28 May 91

[Excerpts] Debates continue at the USSR Supreme Soviet. Today, correspondent Andrey Zuyev is there.

[Zuyev] [passage omitted] Deputy Pupkevich proposed—to the applause of many of his colleagues—that the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA journalist be deprived of his accreditation for insulting the USSR Supreme Soviet in that paper's edition today. I won't give you an account of this insult, in case I am accused of spreading it, and a paper which has fallen into disgrace today be punished for a single journalist. But anyone who is really interested can find out about it in today's edition of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA.

Incidentally, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov said that neither NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA yesterday and KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA today can be forgiven for insulting the Supreme Soviet. Well, we will see, something will happen.

Political & Social

Cabinet Discusses Economic Issues

LD2805194991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1747 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 28 May (TASS)—The question of providing for an equivalent exchange between the agro-industrial complex and other sectors of the economy was considered at today's meeting of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers. Important decisions were adopted which make it possible to restore price parity between town and countryside. In particular, collective and state farms are being freed of certain payments into the budget, and prices have been lowered for mixed feed and individual types of machinery.

The government once again rejected a proposed draft of organizational measures to form market relations and to work out production programs and orders for deliveries of output and fulfillment of work for 1991. The reason

for turning down the document was named as an attempt by its authors to unite elements of a market economy with old-style administrative planning. Instructions have been given to radically rework the draft, putting at its basis planning from the bottom up; direct ties between producers; limitation on the state procurement administration, and expansion in the sphere of applying contractual prices; increasing business activity; and a transfer to internal convertibility of the ruble.

A plan was also endorsed to help regions in Uzbekistan, Turkmeniya and Tajikistan, which suffered as a result of natural disaster.

CPSU Secretariat Discusses Rising Crime Rate

LD2705213191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1910 GMT 27 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 27 May (TASS)—The press center of the CPSU Central Committee reports that a routine session of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat took place under the chairmanship of Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The session discussed a matter to which no honest person can remain indifferent today—the matter of rising crime in the economic sphere.

Bearing in mind the importance of the matter under discussion, communist chairmen and members of a number of committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and heads of law enforcement agenices were invited to the session. The reports by Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB, Boris Pugo, USSR minister of internal affairs, and Nikolay Trubin, USSR procurator general, gave an objective analysis of the crime situation in the economic sphere. A self-critical assessment of the work being done to organize the fight against economic crimes was also heard.

In particular it was noted that crimes are increasingly occurring in those spheres of the economy that are directly involved in satisfying the vital needs of the population. This applies above all to enterprises and organizations engaged in the storage, transportation, and sale of consumer goods. The sharply increased disruption of economic ties, the collapse of the consumer goods market, attempts by many local bodies to regulate it by noneconomic methods, the disruption of supplies, and the delivery of goods to the retail trade network and the creation of artificial shortages are giving rise to crimes. Statistical data were cited which confirm that speculation in the country has risen to massive and threatening proportions and that the number of offenses involving the foreign economic activity system of cooperative, state, and joint enterprises is also rising sharply.

Analyzing these alarming statistics, Yegor Stoyev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, reproached the law enforcement agencies: Why, given the rise in offenses, do most of the perpetrators of crimes and those who aid and abet them go unpunished? In effect, the liberalization of criminal punishment for crimes of little significance has been transferred to dangerous crimes.

Valentin Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, cited the lack of personal safety as one of the most acute problems. The explosion of crime is such that people are constantly concerned for the lives and health of their nearest and dearest.

Noting that legislative bodies are lagging behind the pace of the transition of the country's economy to market relations (first came racketeering and only subsequently, the law on combatting it), Yuriy Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Committee, touched on the causes of the high rate of abuses in cooperatives. The greatest number of breaches of the rule of law happen in cooperatives engaged in predominantly intermediary functions and in the resale of goods.

Secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee Petr Luchinskiy, Boris Gidaspov, Velentin Kuptsov, and others spoke of the decreasing attention paid by local party organizations to participation in the fight against crime in the economic sphere.

Seceretary of the CPSU Central Committee Aleksandr Dzasokhov pointed out the need for closer cooperation between the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Security Council and other bodies of state administration, and for the party line to be more persistently pursued in the law enforcement agencies. He suggested that the USSR Security Council and the Cabinet of Ministers should be acquainted with the view of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat on the matter discussed. The CPSU Central Committee Commission, he said, should also develop the appropriate work and should not compromise with communists who have become reconciled to mismanagement and abuses.

Speaking in conclusion, V.Ivashko noted the acute need for the accelerated adoption of legislative acts aimed at bringing legal practice into line with the existing situation in the economy.

As a result of the discussion a resolution was passed which expresses the party approach to actions aimed at reducing crime in the economic sphere.

The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat also examined such matters as work with party organizations of Soviet establishment abroad.

Fight Against Economic Crime 'Protracted'

LD2405203391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0900 GMT 24 May 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] According to the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, the fight against economic crime has assumed a protracted, defensive character. Annual losses from shortfalls and thefts are in excess of R5 billion, while the loss established by an investigation reaches R200 million. At

the same time, for various reasons, up to 40 percent of criminal cases concerning thefts and speculation are dismissed. The scale of the shadow picking of the state pocket is growing and, according to expert assessments, amounts to at least R70-80 billion per year.

Constitutional Supervision Committee Meets

LD2505132491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1247 GMT 25 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 25 May (TASS)—It was officially announced today that a sitting of the USSR Constitutional Supervision Committee took place on 21-25 May.

With the participation of representatives of state bodies and the country's leading state experts, a discussion was held with regards to the question of the USSR president's norm-making powers. It is intended to prepare a conclusion on the question for the committee's routine sitting, to take place in June. It is planned, at that time, to adopt decisions on the constitutionality of legislative provisions concerning the powers of the militia in the fight against so-called economic sabotage.

A conclusion was adopted on the law's provisions concerning citizenship of Lithuania, which envisages ending the status of USSR citizen for the republic's population. These provisions were found to infringe upon civil rights, and run counter to the USSR Constitution and to universally recognized international standards.

The question of the legal regulation of leasing was examined. It was established that the presence of shortcomings in current legislation is hindering observance of the main provisions on leasing. The committee proposed that it should be established, as a legislative initiative, that leasing at the current stage is one of the main forms of removing state control of enterprises employed by the decision of labour collectives. Proposals were also submitted to the effect that the fundamentals of legislation on leasing should be complemented by provisions excluding the possibility of unjustified limitation by departments in the sphere of leasehold relations.

Orlov Appointed USSR Control Chamber Head

PM2805122591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 May 91 Union Edition p 2

["USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution on USSR Control Chamber Chairman"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

To appoint Comrade Aleksandr Kondratyevich Orlov chairman of the USSR Control Chamber.

[Signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Dated] Moscow, Kremlin, 16 May 1991.

CPSU Central Committee Secretaries Confer

PM2805090591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Conference at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] A conference of secretaries of the party committees of all-union ministries and departments of the USSR, which examined questions of implementing the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee April (1991) Plenum, giving practical assistance to labor collectives' party organizations in resolving problems of stabilizing production, normalizing economic ties, and, in accordance with the USSR president's decree of 16 May 1991, creating conditions for the uninterrupted work of associations and enterprises in the base sectors of the national economy, and further progress toward the market, has been held at the CPSU Central Committee Socioeconomic Policy Department.

Participants in the meeting heard a report from A.M. Anisimov, secretary of the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum and Gas Industry party committee, who was recently elected chairman of the secretaries council of the sector's production collectives. The ministry party committee secretaries supported the idea of creating sectoral councils and noted their great potential in coordinating the activity of the party organizations of related enterprises in different parts of the country and in the successful implementation of anticrisis measures and the tasks of carrying out the economic reform.

The following took part in and addressed the conference: V.A. Kuptsov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, A.G. Melnikov, secretary of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee, A.V. Vlasov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Socioeconomic Policy Department, and P.Ya. Slezko, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission.

Mafia Ready To Control 'Disintegrating' USSR

PM2205142391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 May 91 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Our Mafia in Europe"]

[Text] The Swiss newspaper LA SUISSE notes with alarm that the Soviet mafia's activity both inside the country and in Europe has sharply intensified in the last two years. Its international links have also expanded. Interpol officers are aware of agreements having been concluded between the criminal worlds of the USSR and a number of East European countries on joint operations in a number of spheres. The Soviet-Polish mafia today thus constitutes the third most important in Europe in the trade and production of narcotics so far as influence and financial turnover are concerned.

The leaders of the three largest mafia centers of the USSR—Moscow, Odessa, and Vladivostok—have concluded an agreement with the underworlds of Poland and Belgium on shipping and selling stolen automobiles.

Close cooperation has also been set up between the Soviet and Polish mafia in printing and distributing forged dollars in the USSR.

However, it is the ties between joint ventures and the mafia which are most alarming.

It is a fact that East European countries, including the USSR, have seen a rapid increase in the last two years in the amount of money accumulated by individuals associated with legally dubious transactions. According to figures in the newspaper, the annual revenue of mafia groups in the countries of East Europe is equivalent to $20 billion.

The mafia's influence in the disintegrating Soviet Union continues to grow. Mafia groupings are ready to take power into their control in various republics and oblasts as soon as the process of destroying the unified state is completed. The country has already had to contend with this once—during the civil war, when hosts of armed bands of robbers appeared. However, what is involved today are not anarchic groupings but disciplined and strictly regulated organizations. And how can you combat the mafia if an ordinary bodyguard with them earns 3,000 rubles a month, which is many times more than the wages of an ordinary worker or employee, including a militiaman, the newspaper notes.

KGB Collegium Discusses Security Organs Law

PM2805084791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under the "Today's News" rubric: "At the USSR KGB"]

[Text] The USSR KGB collegium on 24 May discussed priority measures connected with the USSR Supreme Soviet's adoption of the USSR Law "On the organs of state security in the USSR," the USSR KGB public relations center reports.

The sitting noted that for the first time the country's supreme organ of state power has adopted an open act on the state security organs, which is real evidence of the establishment of the rule-of-law socialist state.

It was stressed that the law obliges the USSR KGB and its organs and forces to thoroughly analyze their activity, make it accord fully with the new legal norms, and on that basis substantially increase the effectiveness and reliability of state security work.

Work in all areas must be comprehensively reorganized. This requires the implementation of a package of organizational and legal measures aimed at making the provisions of the law a daily guide to action for the state security organs. There must be a resolute repudiation of the many stereotyped approaches and solutions established over decades which do not accord with the spirit or letter of the new law today.

Kryuchkov Interviewed on State Security Law

PM2905091091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with USSR KGB Chairman V.A. Kryuchkov by correspondent A. Chernyak under the "Top Secret" rubric; place and date of interview not stated: "Cloak of Secrecy Lifted"]

[Text] [Chernyak] Vladimir Aleksandrovich, the Law on State Security Organs in the USSR was adopted 16 May and has recently been published and come into force. It prompted great interest among the public, and that is easily understood: Figuratively speaking, the KGB is within the law now. PRAVDA readers want to know on what legal basis the chekists will be operating in the new, complex, dynamically developing conditions of our life. What will be the significance, in your view, of the newly adopted law ?

[Kryuchkov] First of all, the law clearly defines the legal position of state security organs in our system of statehood. It is no exaggeration to describe this as a historic event, and not only for the state security organs, but for our society too: The appearance of an open law will make it possible in many respects to lift the superimposed cloak of secrecy, innuendo, and doubt, which hover around the public consciousness and surface in the form of rumors and unsubstantiated statements and press items. All this creates a distorted impression of the state security organs and their staffers. Both socially and psychologically, the adoption of the law is undoubtedly a factor tending to improve the moral atmosphere in society in general.

With the adoption of this law, glasnost in the work of KGB organs, which we talk so much about and which, incidentally, we are doing a great deal about, assumes no mere declaratory form, but a very concrete legal form. After all, a paradoxical situation has arisen, whereby the vast majority of citizens in effect know—largely thanks to glasnost—about the main avenues, forms, and methods of the chekists' activity, from artistic or journalistic literature, and yet official legislation deals with the subject sparsely or not at all.

Last and, in my view, most important: When the laws are silent, this gives rise to the danger of manifestations of a subjective and even arbitrary approach in the activity of law enforcement organs. We know very well from history where all this can lead. The law should form a barrier, a reliable guarantee against a possible repetition of the tragic chapters of the past whose shadow, whether we like it or not, falls entirely undeservedly on a new generation of our staffers.

[Chernyak] The USSR as an association of republics on federal principles is now going through a difficult period.

Basically the process under way is a process of formation of a new statehood in which sovereign republics will delegate some of their powers to the center in accordance with the Union treaty, which has not yet been adopted. In this context, how is the question of the demarcation of competence between the USSR KGB and the republics' state security organs being resolved?

[Kryuchkov] The USSR KGB has hitherto operated and will continue to operate, in accordance with the law, as a union-republic state committee. This means that it exercises its basic functions—intelligence and counterintelligence work—both directly and through the republics' state security organs. But that is a commentary on the law, an interpretation of it, whereas in practice for a long time the KGB organs operated exclusively as a centralized organization. I should say that the centralization of the organs in the exercise of a number of functions is inevitable, otherwise they simply cannot exist as a unified system. And in this area the law proclaims centralization, that is, the formulation of a single strategy for the implementation of intelligence and counterintelligence work, the protection of the state border, the defense of state secrets, the pursuit of information analysis work, cadre training, and so forth.

But that does not mean that within the framework of an integrated function—and it is in this sense that state security is indivisible—this function can be exercised only by the center. By no means. Local state security organs, having a good knowledge of the peculiarities of the situation on the spot, are vested with corresponding powers. The law enshrines this approach. In particular, the following tasks are set at republic level: the direct implementation of intelligence and counterintelligence activity, the struggle against terrorism and organized crime, the safeguarding of security at national economic facilities, the protection of the republics' top state officials, and so forth.

Centralization does not, however, deprive the republic state security organs of the freedom to resolve the tasks that face them and to determine their own forms and methods of work, naturally within the framework of common, law-governed principles and norms. This freedom will certainly boost the effectiveness of the territorial organs' activity in, for instance, the sphere of the defense of constitutional order. Here, you will agree, there are specific characteristics which it is beyond the powers of the center alone to take into account or fully grasp. Experience is necessary, of course. In the initial period there may be hitches, but that should not stop us pursuing the path of the demarcation of powers. After all, in the end we have common goals and values. That is what matters!

A number of functions in ensuring state security come under the joint competence of the center and the republics: defending the constitutional system of the USSR and the republics against unlawful infringements, providing regular briefings for organs of state power and management, ensuring the security of special cargoes and means of communication, taking part in measures to normalize the situation in emergency conditions, participating in the implementation of measures to prevent major accidents and disasters, formulating and implementing measures in the sphere of work with state security personnel, and so forth.

Thus a flexible system of collaboration between central and republic organs is set up, such that the legal demarcation of powers does not destroy but, on the contrary, strengthens the unity of functions of all state security organs. In my view, under the new conditions the union-republic structure of departments meets to the greatest possible extent the needs of consolidation in the resolution of state and national economic tasks.

[Chernyak] What guarantees of citizens' rights and interests, in the course of the KGB organs' exercise of their functions, does the law provide for?

[Kryuchkov] That is a very important question. It is indeed necessary for KGB organs to act aggressively in combating subversive activity by foreign special services and criminal assaults on the constitutional system, without imposing unjustified restrictions on the rights of honest people. State security organs employ special means and methods of obtaining information. Once the bounds of established rights and powers are overstepped in the use of this sharp weapon, unjustified infringements of citizens' rights and interests can begin, with all the ensuing consequences.

Article 4 of the law "guarantees of the observance of citizens' rights and freedoms" specially stipulates that citizens' use of rights and freedoms may be restricted only in the cases envisaged by the laws of the USSR and the republics. It provides for the duty of the state security organs to give explanations to citizens, and at their request in written form, regarding the restriction of their rights.

Questions connected with complaints against illegal actions, with the restoration of violated rights and freedoms, compensation for damage caused, and the indictment of the culprits have been resolved.

[Chernyak] In the commentaries of some newspapers regarding the adoption of the law one can encounter the claim that the pooling of intelligence, counterintelligence, and other subdivisions in a single organ creates a dangerous concentration of power. What is your opinion?

[Kryuchkov] This is not the first time I have heard this question. I have already answered it repeatedly. Any system of security organs is formed not over years but over decades. And if we are speaking of the concentration of power, in our history there have been quite long periods when the state security organs belonged to the same structure as the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]. The thrust of the question lies, after all, not in the structure of the security service but in how organically each of its subdivisions complements the others

and thus creates the best conditions for resolving the tasks which have been set. Intelligence and counterintelligence are in many ways not competing "firms" but collaborate and mutually complement each other.

It could be said, for instance, that the KGB is a "monopolist" in the field of intelligence because there are no other state structures connected with the acquisition of information from outside. But you see that is not true. Information is also acquired by military intelligence and the diplomatic service and a number of other state departments and organizations. In just the same way counterintelligence is not a monopolist in the acquisition of information inasmuch as a number of its tasks in the struggle against crime "overlap with" the activity of the MVD organs' operational investigation subdivisions. So that overall there is no monopoly here. Breaking the existing structure of the KGB organs at such a grave period for the country would be at the very least injudicious and from the financial point of view it would be disadvantageous.

[Chernyak] During the discussion of the law in the Supreme Soviet the question of legal and social protection for KGB staffers was repeatedly raised. What did people have in mind here and against whom must the chekists be protected?

[Kryuchkov] They had in mind a quite broad range of questions: The safeguarding of the life and health of staffers against criminal encroachments and compensation for harm caused to their health or property. It is gratifying to note that in assessing the nature of the chekist's profession with its attendant risk to life and health and its physical and psychological stress, the people's deputies resolutely raised the question of expanding the range of people in need of social protection.

Articles 16 and 17 of the law provide for a broad spectrum of measures for the legal and social protection not only of cadre staffers but also of members of their families and of people who voluntarily render assistance to the state security organs in resolving operational tasks.

[Chernyak] You view the law from a professional viewpoint and consequently for you each of its articles is associated with a specific avenue of work, with tasks facing the KGB. Given the importance of all avenues, which can be singled out as the priority one?

[Kryuchkov] Preventive work, that is the orientation of the KGB organs and their staffers toward the prevention of law violations and the consequences they could have for the interests of state security. Preventive work is one of the main avenues in our activity. It has a powerful humanist commitment for it is a case of preventing harm and saving a specific person. But you must not think that preventive work is a simple matter. Quite the opposite, it is very laborious and without any exaggeration we regard it as a yardstick of professional maturity: It spotlights the complexity of the "technology" of our work and the moral position of the chekist—struggling to the last opportunity for man, not against him.

The KGB organs' preventive work requires open standardized regulation, which we did not have before. In that sense preventive work as the main avenue of our activity enshrined in the law is of fundamental importance.

[Chernyak] How in your view will the KGB's work change in connection with the law's adoption?

[Kryuchkov] The adoption of the law places additional responsibility on us. Society has the right to expect that our activity will become more effective and of better quality. I would not like to anticipate in any way, but the adoption of the law will undoubtedly have a positive effect on the psychological mood of the chekists, will give them additional certainty that the state and society need the work they are doing.

It looks as though our work will become far more complex, particularly at the initial stage. Henceforth each step of ours will be checked, and not only by us, against the letter and spirit of the law. The adoption of the law will demand from us chekists a new and considerably more legally oriented way of thinking and the renunciation of many customary and cliched solutions if they do not accord with the new law.

At the same time the new law—and that is dialectic—will facilitate our work. It will make it possible to apply to a greater degree legal means in the activity of the Soviet counterintelligence organs.

The broader use of legal means fully accords with the new identity of the rule-of-law state which is taking shape.

[Chernyak] What gave rise to the creation of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] KGB? What can you say about the protocol on this question signed by you and B.N. Yeltsin?

[Kryuchkov] The lack of an RSFSR KGB did not accord with our state's federative structure system and under the new conditions its creation accords with the objective requirements of our society.

We have a positive attitude toward the creation of the RSFSR KGB. On the president's authorization I have agreed with B.N. Yeltsin on many questions connected with the mechanism for implementing the decisions of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies in this field. The structural shaping of the Russian KGB is now under way. A protocol has been signed providing for the creation of a special commission to resolve a number of organizational questions (structure, tasks, siting, and so forth).

There is an agreement in principle on the demarcation of powers between the USSR KGB and the RSFSR KGB, which is part of the overall scheme enshrined in the law on state security organs in the USSR.

KGB Budget Unchanged Despite Extra Tasks

PM2905082191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 91 p 1

["Own Information" report: "KGB Without Freely Convertible Currency?"]

[Text] Major General Aleksandr Karbainov, chief of the USSR KGB Public Relations Center, told INTERFAX that the USSR Supreme Soviet has authorized the KGB to disclose its budget, which has hitherto been kept secret. The KGB budget and that of the USSR KGB Border Troops totals 4.9 billion rubles.

A. Karbainov stressed that the KGB has been entrusted with new areas of activity, in particular, combating economic and organized crime. However, our budget has not increased as a result. We are performing our tasks by regrouping our own forces and funds.

Admittedly, the figures that have been disclosed do not indicate how much hard currency the USSR KGB is allocated and whether this sum includes funding for the committee's scientific studies.

Shevardnadze, KGB Staffers Interviewed

OW2905105791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1830 GMT 24 May 91

["NATION & SOCIETY"]

[Text] This issue of NATION AND SOCIETY carries an interview with Soviet ex-foreign minister concerning the situation in this country.

Part 2 of the issue covers KGB Under the Spotlight of Glasnost, with senior intelligence, counter-intelligence and other KGB department staffers describing various aspects of the activities of this organistion.

Eduard Shevardnadze: Situation in the Country Is Extremely Complex

President of the Soviet Foreign Political Association Eduard Shevardnadze who is currently in the USA on a tour of lectures about the Soviet Union's domestic political problems, was inteviewed by IF's [INTERFAX] Pyotr Vasiliyev.

Corr.: How would you describe the current situation in the country? Is there any difference [in] the current situation and that in December when you announced your intention to step down as Foreign Minister?

E.Sh.: The situation is very complex and contradictory. It is necessary to act resolutely or to become resigned to the country's literally being on a slippery slope to chaos. I would like to note that the Joint Statement by the country's president and the nine republican leaders has provided the first step toward pooling efforts to prevent the snowballing of ruinous processes. But this is only square zero in a search for ways toward national accord. We should have taken this step one or even two years ago.

The way I see it, perestroyka is beginning to break the impasse it got into some time ago. There are signs of promising trends—but extremely few for now. I would not jump to optimistic conclusions as the situation is extremely complex though, I repeat, there are signs of some promising trends.

Corr.: Mikhail Gorbachev's statement at the CPSU Central Committee plenary meeting that he was ready to step down as General Secretary ws viewed by some as a pre-planned tactic. Do you agree?

E.Sh.: I do not think it was a pre-planned tactic, at least on the part of the president. The demands that Gorbachev resign made at the plenary meeting and calls for a state of emergency in some economic sectors or throughout the country confirm that concerns over the activisation of reactionary forces in the USSR are quite well-grounded. The threat of dictatorship persists.

The name of a possible dictator is now anyone's guess. When chaos reigns, all manner of shady characters no one knows are apt to make it into the political arena.

Corr.: We have been mentioning the need for the democratic forces, party alliances and movements to rally together in order to overcome the destructive processes in the country. But to do this, a common platform is definitely a must. What could provide its basis?

E.Sh.: A platform is needed that can offer society the most reasonable of methods to cope with the situation and the economic crisis, methods leading to a lower tension in society and the building of new relations between nations and ethnic groups. I would like to emphasize that these relations must be absolutely different from the kind of relations we had. The task today is to build a platform for all democratic forces and movements to embrace as something to rally around.

Also, a common language must be found with the relatively progressive conservatives who are also concerned with the state of affairs and are searching for a way to cope with the crisis, except for the extreme right-wingers who are extremely difficult to deal with.

President Gorbachev does not deny he is occupying a position in the centre. In fact, given the situation, he has no viable alternative.

But in the long run, many things, I believe, will depend on how the democratic movement will fare in the national centre, at the republican level and at lower levels. It is in rallying together that I see the most relilable instrument of coping with the crisis and a safeguard from all the clear, present dangers of today. It should also be kept in mind that the chief source of danger is national and ethnic conflicts and a general political tension and struggle that is frequently unhealthy.

And the main threat is that unless we cope with the destructive processes and stabilize the situation in the country, the nation may topple into chaos and anarchy. Hence the well-known danger I mentioned—the threat of a dictatorship and a return to totalitarianism.

Corr.: Relations between the centre and individual republics are plagued by what we know as the war of laws.

E.Sh.: Law-making must become a regulated process, things cannot be allowd to go this way any longer. I believe there have been signs lately that agreement may be on the horizon. In addition, the republican parliaments are realzing that an unending tug-of-war with the USSR Supreme Soviet is a bad policy. The war of laws and presidents is the inevitable result of our failure thus far to build a state ruled by laws.

Some of the republics have already announced that they would not sign the new Union treaty and have taken the appropriate decisions. It is hard to predict at the moment which course the developments would take, but I believe that we should immediately start a multilateral dialogue between the republics themselves, in the centre-republic format or with the countries that have declared their secession from the Union. Nothing but dialogue can move us closer to the resolution of all outstanding problems that are still in the way of our starting this dialogue. I rule out the use of force: We cannot preserve the Union and will ruin the political, economic and other ties which are now frail as it is.

It is often claimed now that President Gorbachev has made concessons to this or that republlc. I am not really fond of using such terms in relation to either party. The process of the formation of a new Union and a new alliance should certainly ential compromises on the part of the Centre and on the part of the republics. I believe that the republics should be given as broad powers and functions as possible, and they would have to consent which of the powers they wanted to delegate to the centre. I welcome compromises both from the centre and the republics. I want to emphasize that the joint statement by the leaders of the nine republics is the first sensible step. I cannot venture any guess as to how much ground will be covered; many things will depend on the kind of contacts we develop and the nature of the dialogue. I have no explanation of situations in which high-level executives within one county cannot find a common ground. When the country is in such a bad plight as it is now, very many differences should be backpedaled for the sake of a serious dialogue.

KGB Under the Spotlight of Glasnost

The national Supreme Soviet has passed a law on state security bodies in the USSR. It defines the aims, principles of work, the responsibilities and rights of security bodies as well as the system of control over their activity. For the first time in Soviet history a legal act of that nature has been made public. Up till now the KGB's work was regulated by eight resolutions of the national parliament and about eight hundred governmental acts—all classified.

IF's Pyotr Neev reports about a round-table discussion that has been held in Moscow involving high-level KGB officials and titled KGB UNDER THE SPOTLIGHT OF GLASNOST.

Corr.: Under the new law one of the principal tasks of the state security bodies is to conduct intelligence operations abroad and furnish Soviet power structures with the necessary information thus collected. Says first deputy head of the Foreign Intelligence Department of the KGB Gen-Lieut Vadim Kirpichenko [V.K.]

V.K.: Soviet inteligence agents abroad always have to work under cover. They should possess a consummate knowledge of their "principal profession"—that of an engineer, diplomat, or journalist. Usually they are well-versed in at least two foreign languages, should also have a natural charm and communication talents.

Foreign intelligence has as its primary goal the gathering of varied information of political nature that helps draw up a detailed picture of the real state of things in a particular country. To ensure a reliable defense of our state and facilitate the development of its economy we seek information of scientific nature. If whatever information about sophisticated Western technologies we have been able to accumulate was utilised to the full we'd be far better-off than we are now.

Soviet intelligence agents are also charged with ensuring the security of Soviet official institutions abroad—embassies, trade departments, media bureaus—as well as the security of their personnel.

Corr.: Obviously, foreign intelligence services have the very same tasks to fulfil on the Soviet territory. Anatoliy Klimenko [A.K.], a senior counter-intelligence officer, says:

A.K.: Foreign intelligence services see the current situation in this country as extremely favourable. Naturally, this boosts the role of the Soviet counter-inteligence service. Over 30 foreign agents have been disclosed over the last years, some of them posing threat to the nation's security. Among them are Tolkachev, Smetanin, Polyakov.

We work hand in glove with customs departments and our joint effort in combatting drug-trafficking has yielded 30 million rubles—the money that was returned to the state over the last few years.

Drug-trafficking in this country has become a well-organized criminal business seeking active contacts with "counterparts" abroad.

Invaluable cultural possessions are smuggled out of the country each year. 30,000 attempts at illegal transportation of precious paintings, icons, antique items and church relics have been cut short in one year. Experts estimated their aggregate worth to total 3 million rubles.

Raw materials and half-possessed goods are smuggled too, primarily metals. Last year as much as 3,100,000 tons of metals was smuggled abroad, together with 500,000 tons of oil products. Last year we cut short the operation of an international contraband group, involving Soviet, Polish and Vietnamese citizens that tried to get 20 kilos of gold across the border in a specially equipped hiding-place in a train leaving Moscow for Warsaw. Over the last three years the KGB seized about 15,000 tons of narcotics bound for destinations in this country.

The danger of drug-trafficking groups is that they are a favourite target for foreign secret services who try to use them for their own purposes.

Corr.: In 1989 the notorious "ideological" agency, a branch of the KGB, was disbanded in a drive to put an end to political persecutions. The law approved by the Soviet parliament stipulates that the KGB bases its work on the principles of legality and respect for human rights and freedoms. In a pioneering jesture the law grants Soviet citizens the right to sue the security bodies if they (the citizens) have been wronged.

The dissolution of the ideological department was followed by the creation of an agency on the defense of the Soviet constitutional order. Says Col Yuriy Isaev [Yu.I.], deputy head of an agency department:

Yu.I.: Our tasks are to neutralise foreign secret services and subversive centers seeking to destabilise the situation in the Soviet Union and use force to overthrow the existing constitutional regime. We are also charged with combatting terrorism and uncovering the causes and conditions of mass disturbances, as well as confining them to particular locations.

Despite an improvement in East-West relations the West's subversive activities have intensified. Even though some Soviet media insist that NTS (the Russian acronym for the People's Labor Union) no longer is a subversive organisation but rather a helpful hand for perestroyka these assertions are far from the truth. The Union continues to adhere fast to its program that states as its chief aim the attainment of a change in the political system of the USSR. In Moscow and Leningrad the Union has officially registered branches, but the information we possess points to a network of illegal subsidiaries of the organisation across the country. They deal in arms, penetrate the Soviet Armed Forces, getting ready for an armed insurgence against the Soviet regime when the time comes.

Another example of such a subversive center is the radio station "Liberty", featured in some Soviet newspapers as an "information" agency. On the face of it the description is fitting, yet in reality "Liberty" is a European branch of the CIA, conducting political intelligence, recruiting agents to get access to vital information.

Political terrorism is gaining momentum in this country too, largely caused by inter-ethnic strife. In the last three years over 2,000 people fell victims to political terror, and another 10,000 people were wounded. Cumulative material damage incurred is estimated to be 6 billion rubles. In a number of operations we seized several militant groups from Trans-Caucasian republics, who were caught red-handed purchasing weapons in the heart of the Russian Federation.

Corr.: Often enough the KGB has to fulfill tasks not relating directly to its designation. To a considerable degree this can be attributed to growing nationalist tendencies and organised crime in the Soviet Union. Their scope calls for a comprehensive program of combatting these ills.

A special department for combatting organised crime has recently been set up within the KGB. Col Aleksander Kotov [A.K.] explains:

A.K.: Organised crime is extremely dangerous politically and socially. Leaders of these criminal gangs usually seek to seize key power levers, aggravating corruption in the power structures which they use as a cover against a possible clamp-down of law enforcement bodies.

Foreign trade which is now accelerating rapidly is used as a tool for criminal gangs to expand their activities abroad. Moreover, we are right now facing a very real threat of foreign mafiosi groups reaching out into this country.

Criminals are increasingly fostering ties with the so-called second or shadow economy.

Our department, however young, disclosed about three hundred criminal groupings during seventeen last months [as received] and returned to to the state millions of rubles.

Corr.: To be able to cope with these mammoth tasks the KGB needs an extensive apparatus. What does it cost the tax payer? After all, the KGB's budget could well reflect its scope of activities. This may be one of the reasons why the figure has never been disclosed in this country. However, in times of glasnost, we did get an answer to this question too.

Gen-Maj Aleksander Karabaynov [A.K.] of the KGB Public Relations Department says.

A.K.: The USSR Supreme Soviet has allowed us to make public the size of our budget. Together with the border-guard agency our annual budget stands at 4.9 billion rubles. Our tasks are expanding now, to include combatting crimes in the economy, and fighting organised crime. Yet we are not getting extra money to cover the expenses involved. We are doing that by regrouping our own forces and maximising our potential.

Shevardnadze's Policy Group Set Up in Leningrad

OW2905050491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] The Soviet foreign policy association led by the former foreign minister Eduard Shevardnadze is setting up its branch in Leningrad. According to the organizing committee of the founding conference of the branch, the affiliation is being established at the request of Eduard Shevardnadze who asked local scholars for aid in creating the working model of a demilitarized world free from nuclear arms and violence, and in devising the ways to maintain security in it. According to the organizers of the Leningrad branch, they also intend to intensify international contacts in science, culture and arts between Leningrad and Western countries.

The founding conference is to be held in early June. It will be attended by Eduard Shevardnadze.

Leaseholders, Entrepreneurs Congress Ends

LD2605084291 Moscow TASS in English 0742 GMT 26 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Veronika Romanenkova]

[Text] Moscow May 26 TASS—A congress of Soviet leaseholders and entrepreneurs has become a new stage along the road to a market in the Soviet Union.

The congress, which ended here on Saturday, was attended by President Mikhail Gorbachev who supported further development of the leaseholders' movement and the dissemination of various types and forms of ownership in the country.

The delegates discussed problems that restrain the development of leasing arrangements and entrepreneurship in the USSR. The main problem, they believe, is the imperfection of the current legislation.

Speakers at the forum emphasised that some governmental decisions taken recently "undermine the economic interests of collectives in boosting the output, in raising labour productivity and reducing production costs".

At the same time, delegates believe, the adoption of laws stimulating the development of new progressive forms of economic management all forms of ownership and transition to market relations is being unfoundedly delayed.

Therefore, the congress decided to send the proposals made by participants in the congress, who represent the interests of more than 11 million Soviet entrepreneurs, to the president of the USSR, the parliament and the Cabinet of Ministers.

Much attention at the congress was also devoted to international cooperation because, as many a speaker pointed out, it is precisely direct contacts with Western business circles that will help the USSR to get out to the world market as soon as possible.

Popular Front Group Opposes Union Treaty

OW2905054991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] The Assembly of Popular Fronts and Movements opposing the Union treaty has been set up in Kishinev, the capital of Moldova, at a conference of public movements. Attending the conference were representatives of the Armenian National Movement, the Estonian Popular Front, Georgian "Round Table", Latvia's Popular Front, the Lithuanian movement "Sajudis" and Moldova's Popular Front. The assembly will be called "the Kishinev Forum".

Journalists Accuse Media of Breaching Rights

OW2705071291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 24 May 91

[Text] The leadership of the all-Union state television and radio company is acting in violation of a clause in the Law on Freedom of the Press, guaranteeing the rights of Soviet citizens of access to information, as well as the journalists' right to professional activity, Eduard Sagalayev, President of the Journalists' Union told union members.

The manifestation of these violations, said Sagalayev are the recent editions of thet late night national TV news program "Vremya". The program failed to mention the recent events in Minsk, the capital of Belorussia and did not offer a report on the press conference held by Vadim Bakatin, a Russian presidential candidate.

"Of course, these decisions are not taken by Mr Kravchenko (head of the company) himself", said the union president. According to Sagalayev, "Vremya" is a tool in big politics.

At the same time Sagalayev said that Mr Kravchenko's expulsion from the Journalists' Union may be considered legally unsound, since the union has not yet approved its rules specifying conditions of union membership.

Supreme Court Clarification on Media Defamation

PM2805094391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the USSR Supreme Court"]

[Text] In connection with the adoption of the USSR Law "On the Press and Other Mass Media," the USSR Supreme Court has received communications from mass media and courts in which the question is raised of the correlation of the said Law with Article 7 of the Fundamentals of USSR and Union Republic Civil Legislation on the Protection of Citizens' and Organizations' Honor and Dignity.

By a 17 May 1991 resolution the USSR Supreme Court Plenum clarifies that if the information that is being challenged by the plaintiff has been reproduced by a

mass medium from official statements, speeches delivered at meetings, or attributed statements that have been broadcast, or obtained from a news agency (Article 38 of the USSR Law "On the Press and Other Mass Media"), the courts are obliged to involve as defendant in the case in addition to the editorial board of the mass medium in question, also the organ or individual who was the source of this information. In this case the obligation to prove that the disseminated information corresponds to reality falls on the said organ or individual.

In accordance with Article 7 of the Fundamentals of Civil Legislation the publication in the press or any other medium (radio, television, and so forth) of a court decision defining the disseminated information as defamatory to the honor and dignity of the plaintiff and at variance with reality, has to take place in the very same mass media.

Citizens and organizations are authorized to instigate a court action simultaneously against several mass media or other organs and individuals who have disseminated information which does not correspond to reality and is defamatory to the former's honor and dignity.

Western Aid Useless Without Domestic Realism

PM2805144791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 May 91 Second Edition pp 1,6

[Political observer Tomas Kolesnichenko article under the "View from Moscow" rubric: "Spur of the Moment Decision or Sober Calculation]

[Text] Recently the figures "9+1," "7+1," have acquired a magical ring. Everything has its own logic. Thus it is no wonder that since the well known "9+1" statement not only has the domestic political situation in our country changed, so has the attitude of the outside world as it watches us closely.

Although we still have not experienced this in practice and although life is becoming increasingly grim, it is absolutely obvious that in the labyrinth of our seemingly insoluble difficulties a distant light has begun to glimmer. This fact alone demonstrates the tremendous potential contained in the document signed by the nine republic leaders and the USSR president.

Paradoxically, the document does not state the "historic achievements" so familiar to our ears, it does not proclaim ultimate ideological truths, it does not urge "giant steps" into some abstract "bright future," what it does offer is a specific program or, more precisely, a principle for the organization of our society and state for today and a way out of the profound political and economic crisis.

It is well known that the significant sometimes appears simple, even banal. Is that not why quite a few people are now shrugging their shoulders and saying: Avoid confrontation, stabilization... Is that all? After all, such words have already been heard many times from the president and in speeches by our parliamentarians. And so they have, many times. But the characteristic feature of the present situation is that this truth has been perceived by various political forces currently at loggerheads in our society. The appeals have finally acquired real substance. In other words, the babble of voices is dying down, the country is beginning to speak the language of realism. It is the latter fact which has had for some observers an unexpectedly great impact in the international arena. After all, the main arguments (albeit sometimes far-fetched ones) which were recently used as an obstacle to the development of mutual relations between the West and the Soviet Union are now being called into question: arguments such as the confusion between the center and the republics, the ineffectiveness of the authorities, the unpredictable development of the situation in our country, even up to the possibility of a return to totalitarianism, inconsistency in the transition to the market, and so on and so forth.

Now the "9+1" agreement has clarified matters. The question of "who is who" in our state is not in doubt. And there has been a response. It is a long time since we heard President Bush use the words he spoke in Washington recently during his joint press conference with FRG Chancellor Kohl: "We both express confidence in President M.S. Gorbachev. I should like to take this opportunity to stress the complete agreement in our support for M.S. Gorbachev. I want a summit meeting with M.S. Gorbachev..."

However, there is a question which (it must be admitted) constantly disturbs our public and even causes it a certain amount of suspicion: How sincere is the West's interest in our success, is it not, on the contrary, pushing us toward the brink, and does it not really yearn for the weakening and disintegration of the Soviet Union?

A difficult question, the answers to which must be sought on the basis of the actual situation which has developed both in our country and throughout the world and not in some pseudotheoretical postulates about the "confrontation between the two systems" which for any years obscured our view of real life. Of course, there are quite a few in the West who would rejoice if we disappeared without trace one fine day. It does not matter whether you call them anti-Sovietists, anticommunists, even "anti-Russians." Such people exist, and that, as they say, is an indisputable fact.

But the point is that we are not going to disappear. Furthermore, I am confident that not only Russia but our entire Union will consequently endure the present trials. The actual point is the price that our people and consequently all world civilization is going to pay for this. If we have to pay an inordinate price, if in the near future we sink into chaos and poverty, neither Europe nor America will emerge "unscathed." They will not have it easy. For better or for worse, everything is interconnected in this world. Therefore it is in the West's interests (its interests and not out of love for us) to help

our country to overcome this difficult period with minimum losses. And certainly not to incite our anti-perestroyka forces to seek revenge.

The United States spent $60 billion on the "war in the desert" to combat one dictator from a comparatively small state, then passed the hat around and collected $100 billion. This is considered a large sum. How much will it pay for a new arms race, for new confrontation if, God forbid, the world goes back to the cold war—600 billion, 6 trillion? No one knows. And, I hope, no one will ever come to know because then there would be a threat of that same world catastrophe with which we intimidated each other—understandably—for the past 45 years. Conversely, the effective cooperation between our economy and that of the West and our integration in the world economy open up new horizons for us and for the West, too: Suffice it to recall that our gross product even now exceeds that of the FRG, for example.

Serious Western economists, notably Professor Sachs from the United States, have already calculated that to effectively help to implement economic reforms in the USSR it will need approximately $30 billion each year for the next five years. An impressive figure, but only at first glance. After all, $30 billion is less than 0.2 percent of the industrialized world's GNP, and the immediate contribution of, say, the United States would form just 1 percent of its annual military spending. If you take a broader view, a different picture emerges in place of spending. Sachs himself pointed this out quite recently in an article in THE WASHINGTON POST: "In fact," he writes, "the United States would save vast sums if our help led to the appearance of a more peaceful Soviet Union and thus made it possible to reduce the NATO budget." So, life itself urges the developed West to adopt a comprehensive program of involvement in our perestroyka.

As for the Soviet Union, the idea of the global interdependence of the modern world underpinned the new thinking and became the pivot of our foreign policy from the outset of perestroyka. So it is no surprise that in addition to the development of bilateral mutually beneficial ties with the industrialized states, M.S. Gorbachev has recently voiced the idea of establishing contacts with the big seven as a whole. It is this sober calculation, not a spur of the moment decision as some of our press organs try to present it (such illumination on the part of talented scientists), which forms the basis of the idea of effective cooperation between the reformist leadership of the USSR with the G7 countries. Thus it was that the now well known "Address to the Group of Seven" appeared, bearing the signatures of Ye. Primakov and G. Yavlinskiy. This initiative by the USSR president, which found support from the representatives of the republics, will be continued. The next round is the trip to Washington at the end of this month by Security Council member Ye. Primakov and First Deputy Prime Minister V. Shcherbakov, when there will be contacts with top representatives of the U.S. Administration. G. Yavlinskiy is in the United States right now, meeting with U.S. experts. To cut a long story short, a concrete action program is being worked out.

A meeting is planned between M.S. Gorbachev and a group of U.S. economists and agriculturalists who are now in the USSR. But the real opportunity for reaching fundamental accords and discussing technical details with the USSR's involvement would be at the G7 meeting in London 15-17 June.

The participation in this meeting of a Soviet delegation and even of the USSR president seems highly logical. By all accounts, the majority of the G7 members are ready to put such an invitation to M.S. Gorbachev. Bush is wavering more than the rest. He has directly stated that first he wants to hear the proposals and new ideas on economic reforms in the USSR that Primakov is bringing to Washington. However, the U.S. president's position is influenced primarily, some believe, by the situation in the disarmament sphere. Western observers believe that the U.S. president links the G7's help for the Soviet reforms (and M.S. Gorbachev's participation in the London meeting naturally presupposes specific decisions on this question) with the range of disarmament talks, which have become more complex recently.

I believe that even this problem can be resolved, on a basis of compromise, of course. In any event, until recently the U.S. President resisted the temptation to use diktat after the "victory in the desert," unlike some of his colleagues. Diktat is outmoded, especially when applied to us.

But we, too, have finally to stand up and be counted, as they say nowadays. The program of reforms currently being worked out in the USSR must be implemented without fail by next fall. It is necessary to distinguish between diktat and the proposals which the G7 may make with a view to helping our reforms. Their ideas will formulate not "general principles" but specific scales, timetables, and forms of economic assistance. I, too, "like the vastness of our plans," but the experience of past 5-year plans, alas, suggests that these plans sometimes remain on paper. We will not receive real support from the West for paper plans. We need actions, clear and consistent ones, furthermore, with no wavering or backing down. Essentially this is no longer just a "move toward the market" but the creation in the USSR of an open economic system and its integration into the world economy.

Does it need to be said that all this is possible only if the Union is preserved and if there is a clear demarcation of powers between the center and the republics on the basis of the rational decentralization of power and the federalization of the Union executive organs. The principle of the division of power, the development of democracy, and the consolidation of all the healthy forces in society enshrined in the "9+1" agreement—all this must be worked for and expressed in a concrete program for the stabilization of our

state, the creation of an affective economy, and the preservation of a single economic space. Without that no Western participation will help us.

We must help ourselves first of all.

Foreign Ministry Screens Film on Perestroyka

PM2805114491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 May 91 Second Edition p 6

[I. Mosin report: "'The Second Russian Revolution'"]

[Text] "The Second Russian Revolution"—that is the title of a six-part television series filmed for the BBC. A screening of the first two episodes, "Enter Gorbachev" and "The Battle for Glasnost," was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center for the Soviet and foreign public. What are the programs about? About perestroyka, its directors and extras, you and me, the six tough years of perestroyka. We meet once again with L. Brezhnev and Yu. Andropov, K. Chernenko and N. Tikhonov, Ye. Ligachev and A. Yakovlev.

The film's creators concentrated on the most crucial and vivid moments in perestroyka: N. Andreyeva's letter, Chernobyl, the power struggle in the top political echelons. Doubtless that is why the films have turned out to be vivid, dynamic, and gripping in both action and thought. The authors of the series, it seems to me, have tried to be as objective and well-disposed as possible in their approach to showing this most difficult period in our history. I sincerely envy the millions of Western BBC viewers who are already watching the first episodes of "The Second Russian Revolution," and I sincerely regret the fact that we do not yet have the opportunity, because of currency difficulties.

Sakharov Commemorative Congress Ends in Moscow

LD2505235391 Moscow TASS in English 2032 GMT 25 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Maxim Pasko]

[Text] Moscow May 25 TASS—The first international congress to commemorate Soviet human rights activist Andrey Sakharov "Peace, Progress, Human Rights" ended in Moscow on Saturday.

The congress was attended by Soviet and Russian parliamentarians, prominent Soviet and foreign politicians, scientists, cultural and public figures, including President Mario Soares of Portugal, chairman of the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly Alexander Dubcek, former Italian Prime Minister Bettino Craxi, Soviet parliamentarian Yuriy Boldyrev, Soviet publicist Igor Klyamkin, Italian literary critic Vittorio Strada, U.S. Sovietologist Robert Conquest, one of the former leaders of the Soviet "dissident movement" Yuriy Orlov, now living in the United States, and others.

On May 21, the opening ceremony of the congress, timed to coincide with Sakharov's 70th birth anniversary, was attended by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and chairman of the Russian Parliament Boris Yeltsin.

The congress worked in four sections: the structure of power, the state and individual, reform of law enforcement bodies, and violations of law as regards individuals on a mass scale.

They worked under the keynote "the Soviet Union and East European countries on the path from totalitarianism to democracy."

They propose that the Soviet parliament, congresses of Soviet people's deputies, republics' legislatures conduct their law-making activities more actively and observe the letter and the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act and other international documents, to which the USSR is a signatory.

They also recommended to set up, in accordance with the Soviet Constitution, independent institutions under the national and republican parliaments, to supervise the observance of human rights. They should have the right to veto laws and norm-setting acts, which run counter to the Soviet Constitution.

They stressed that disputes should be settled on the basis of international law.

The forum urged the Congress of Soviet People's Deputies to set up commissions to investigate recent clashes in Vilnius and Riga.

Participants stressed the need for regular news conferences by the Soviet president and other leaders of the country and a specialised periodical to publish all laws and norm-setting acts.

Participants stressed that these recommendations do not aim to interfere in the USSR's internal affairs. They will help bring Soviet legislation in compliance with international law, primarily as regards individuals' basic rights and freedoms.

However, many speakers referred to the "lack of dynamism in society's move towards a civil and civilised state."

Caroline Cox from Great Britain, a member of the group "Mass Violations of Individuals' Rights" urged the governments of all countries to "refrain from attending a conference on the human dimension of the Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe in Moscow this summer, until the Soviet Union shows real progress in carrying out democratic reforms, protecting human rights, and ensuring the freedom of speech, conscience, meetings and movement."

Another group of experts dealt with "global consequences of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant disaster and the future of nuclear power engineering."

They proposed to publish all facts about nuclear power plant accidents in the Soviet Union that occurred before 1986 and take measures to prevent concealment of similar facts in the future under the pretext of their "secrecy."

Experts recommend to set up the independent "international committee of advisers-observers" to prepare annual reviews on the Chernobyl nuclear power plant and contaminated areas, conduct medical check-ups of people affected by the disaster and inform them about the dosage of radiation they had got, and set up three "international Sakharov high schools for radiation" in the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Russia.

Sakharov's wife Yelena Bonner said in her closing remarks that recommendations and proposals made at the congress reflect experts' personal and independent viewpoints. Sakharov based his activities exactly on this principle, she said.

TASS Reviews Press for 29 May

LD2905071491 Moscow TASS in English 0654 GMT 29 May 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Today's newspapers highlight President Mikhail Gorbachev's tour of Kazakhstan.

The Soviet leader visited several collective farms in Kokchetav region, PRAVDA and TRUD report.

At Zlatopolskiy farm, Gorbachev met leaseholders, party and state officials to discuss economic and social development in the republic.

Russia's presidential election campaign is in full swing, newspapers write. PRAVDA interviews Colonel General Albert Makashov, 52, who is running for the presidency.

"My principles—to do everything for society, for man, preserving socialist values of our state, without destroying what we have already," Makashov said, commenting on his economic programme.

"We should widely use the international experience of combining plan and market regulation, in accordance with practices employed in the United States, Japan and Western Europe," he said.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA runs an interview with presidential candidate Aman Tuleev.

Economic reforms should be implemented on a regional basis, he believes.

"Every region has its own market, peculiarities and ability to develop industries. I would prioritise giving a higher degree of economic freedom to each industrial and farming region," Tuleev said.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA comment on the decision by the Tatar parliament not to take part in the Russian presidential election.

"The decision is so sensational, that it is impossible to understand the deputies' position without knowing what's behind it," SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes.

The republic's parliament took this unprecedented decision under the pressure of circumstances that developed in the republic after the passage of the declaration of sovereignty, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA writes.

The Soviet cabinet met on May 28 to discuss ways to ensure equivalent prices for farm products and industrial goods, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA reports.

PRAVDA carries an interview with KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov.

The passage of a bill on state security bodies will help clear public doubts and apprehensions about the agency, Kryuchkov believes.

PRAVDA reports about a telephone conversation between Gorbachev and Bush. The two presidents discussed arms control and bilateral economic cooperation.

The newspaper covers a session of the North Atlantic Assembly in Rotterdam.

For the first time the session was attended by parliamentarians from the Warsaw Treaty countries, who were invited as associated delegates, it says.

Angola is moving towards peace, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA writes, commenting on a ceasefire agreement between the UNITA rebels and the government.

The Soviet Union and the United States supplied the warring factions with weapons for many years but now helped end the fratricidal war, the newspaper says.

The Soviet Union and Poland have failed to achieve a compromise at talks on the Soviet withdrawal from Poland, Soviet northern group of forces commander Viktor Dubinin said in an interview with KRASNAYA ZVEZDA.

The sides failed to agree on property and financial issues, he said. Dubinin said Warsaw was dragging its feet on the issue.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA analyses the results of the Gulf war. Radio-electronic warfare helped the multi-national forces defeat Iraqi troops, it writes.

Economic

Draft Bill on Indexing Incomes Approved

OW2905051491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] On Tuesday the 5th session of the Supreme Soviet approved in principle a draft of USSR and republican legislation on indexing people's monetary incomes. The draft says that if monthly increases in the prices of consumer goods exceed 5%, people's incomes will be subject to indexing within 3 months. During debates on the draft speakers said that in the current year the rise in the cost of life in the USSR has surpassed the growth of people's incomes for the first time ever. Since January 1, 1991 prices increased by 26%, while people's incomes rose by 19%. According to Ivan Laptev who presided over the plenary session, this makes the bill on indexing people's incomes particularly important.

The Supreme Soviet instructed its working group to finalize the draft which is to be subjected to further debates in June.

Minimum Income Plan Under Consideration

PM2405094591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[V. Romanyuk article under general heading "USSR President's Decree on the Minimum Consumer Budget": "IZVESTIYA Observer's Commentary"]

[Text] What, primarily, is the issue here? In our unsettled age, filled with the fear of impending poverty, it is a question of defining at state level what the minimum consumer budget should realistically be, and what it actually is. What ways out of the prevailing situation can there be?

The USSR Ministry of Labor and Social Questions has announced that the average minimum consumer budget across the country is estimated at 227 rubles [R]. In fact, the Union-average consumer budget amounts to R140. As we can see, the gap between what is desirable and the reality is still very large at present.

Let us also take into consideration the fact that mean statistical indicators are deceptive things. Poverty is spread unevenly across the country, there are areas of frankly glaring poverty. All the calculations were made, it is true, before 2 April 1991: In Estonia only 3 percent of the inhabitants had a monthly income of less than R100, in Belorussia 7 percent, and in the Russian Federation and the Ukraine 11 percent, whereas in Kirghizia the figure was 47 percent, in Turkmenistan and Azerbaijan 49 percent, in Uzbekistan 57 percent, and in Tajikistan 69 percent.

It is important to take all this into consideration when formulating priority social protection measures for the poorer sections of the population. The first step will be the establishment of special funds—Union and republican. Minimum levels of pay, pensions, benefits, and grants will be set taking into account the minimum consumer budget level. This year the intention is to implement a program of assistance in kind for the poor. Citizens on low incomes will have the right to receive free medicines and certain types of clothing, which includes distribution on an individual coupon basis; it is intended to organize free food distribution for the poor.

It is hard to acknowledge the existence of poor and needy people in our socialist fatherland. But it would also be immoral to go on concealing this regrettable fact.

Paper on Success of Joint Ventures

LD2805205191 Moscow TASS in English 1201 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Today's "PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK" newspaper ("Government Herald") reports that more than 3,000 joint ventures [JVs] have been registered in the Soviet Union. Their invested capital amounts to seven billion roubles, 38 percent of which belongs to foreign firms from 73 countries.

The newspaper notes that, although only 1,027 of the JVs produce goods, their commodity output and services have increased almost five times over 1989 figures and equal 4.3 billion roubles. Approximately one fifth of the commodities and services (worth 900 million roubles) produced by joint ventures is intended for export and for hard currency trade inside the Soviet Union. Rouble sales inside the country have increased four-fold and currency sales have tripled. The rate of the rouble is slowly climbing.

Such well known joint firms as "Lenwest", "Belwest", "Rifle-Krasnodar", "Fintek" and others have delivered 730 million roubles-worth of consumer goods to Soviet shops.

Conoco To Produce Oil, Gas in USSR

OW2905052291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Conoco Overseas Oil Company, jointly with European and Soviet firms, is planning to implement a number of projects during the next few years for running oil and gas fields in the Soviet Union. The oil and gas thus produced are to be sold on the Soviet and international markets.

The biggest part of Conoco's programme is the Stokman Project envisaging the production of gas in the Stokman gas field in the Barents Sea. Its implementation got underway at the end of 1989, when a consortium of the European companies Imatran Voima Oy, Metra Oy Ab, Neste Oy, Norsk Hydro a.s, plus Conoco signed a protocol of intent with the production amalgamation Arktikmorneftegasrazvedka of the Soviet Ministry of Oil and Gas Industry, which controls the prospecting and production of

oil and gas in the shelf of the USSR's Arctic region. The goal of the project is joint production, transportation and sale of natural gas to Soviet and European consumers.

At the moment, the consortium has developed the technical and economic principles of the project, whose total worth, in certain estimates, amounts to 10 billion dollars.

The consortium is to present this document for analysis to Soviet state experts and, if the document is approved, to start a joint venture which will be in charge of the industrial development of this oil and gas field. Supplies of natural gas from the Stokman deposit, whose extracted resources are estimated at 2.5 billion cubic metres, are to begin in the late 1990s.

Concurrently, Conoco is involved in the development of two projects for the production of oil and gas in the Nenetsky Autonomous Region in the north of the Russian Federation, in conjunction with the amalgamations Arkhangelskgeologiya and Komineft, and, in the Tyumen region (Western Siberia), with the amalgamations tyumenneftegaz and Tyumengeologiya.

The implementation of the conoco projects in the Soviet Union were discussed during the talks between Soviet officials, including the Russian Federation's leaders, and Conoco's President, Konstantin Nicandros, during his visit to the Soviet Union at the end of May. During the talks, the Soviet side expressed readiness, to back the Stokman project, if necessary, with the Russian government's guarantees.

The production of oil and gas, and the provision of licences for exporting them from the Soviet Union is under the Soviet Government's control. However, the situation may change in connection with the republics' demands for the right to quote and licence the exports of raw materials.

Poll Shows Growing Pessimism Over Economy

PM2705140391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 May 91 Union Edition p 7

["Poll" report by Aleksey Levinson: "Optimists in January and April"]

[Text] It has become good form to say that everything is very bad in our country. If only it were a matter of waiting lines alone. "Official pessimism" has set in in highly official publications and television broadcasts which once were renowned for official optimism. Against this backdrop it seems particularly interesting to count how many optimists there are left in the country.

On the same day every month All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion on Social and Economic Questions interviewers asked 2,000 Soviet inhabitants a standard question: "What lies in store for the USSR in the economic sphere in the next few months?" (Similar questions are asked about political life, interethnic relations, and certain other problems).

Here are the results for the first four months of this year, indicating something about the ratio of "optimists" to "pessimists."

People are entitled to judge the situation in the whole country's economy by the state of their own "household economy." Since only 6 percent of those polled in April (as opposed to 12 percent in January) noted that their family's material situation had improved, and 70 percent said that it had deteriorated, it is not surprising that only three in 100 people expect a "significant improvement" in economic affairs. (In the period January-March the figure was four in 100, but the fourth person has evidently become a pessimist since the beginning of April.) There are a few more people with more modest hopes of "some improvement in the situation." In January they totalled 16 percent, while by mid-April 12 percent remained.

It was during these months that the central government issued various statements and programs promising stabilization. The aforementioned figures do not allow us to say that these statements had a positive effect on sentiments in society. At the same time practical steps taken by the government—above all the April price hike—visibly affected these sentiments: The number of people expecting a "significant deterioration in the situation" over the next few months remained virtually unchanged January through March and soared in April by almost "an octave" from 39 to 46 percent.

Confidence in the people who are, in society's eyes, responsible for these measures has declined by a similar amount. The number of people whose trust in the Soviet leadership has "considerably lessened"—a figure that rose fairly slowly in the first quarter—increased by 7.5 percent at a stroke in April, reaching 60.5 percent.

Roughly one-fifth of our respondents feel optimistic when assessing the prospects for the country's political life. This figure also fluctuates in response to individual events. Presumably the "natural slide into pessimism" that has been noticeable as the backdrop to the last few months was halted by the results of the referendum (we will not discuss now exactly what they were). At any rate, by mid-April for every optimist there were three people expecting some deterioration in the political situation.

The sphere of "interethnic relations" sees the highest concentration of hopes for an improvement. It is, after all, here that immediate peace is most needed. More than one-fourth of the country's inhabitants expect an end to events that are very often used to camouflage actions with purely political motives. Those forces that know that they cannot win the political struggle if it takes a civilized, parliamentary-democratic form are imparting to the struggle the barbaric form of interethnic conflicts. The fact that at the end of April half the country's population did not expect an "improvement in the situation" here plays into their hands.

Mir Cosmonauts Return to Earth 26 May

24 May Space Experiments Reported

LD2405175491 Moscow TASS in English 1634 GMT 24 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow May 24 TASS—Soviet cosmonauts Viktor Afanasyev, Musa Manarov, Anatoliy Artsebarsky, Sergey Krikalev and British researcher Helen Sharman began their working day on Friday at 8:00 Moscow time.

Sharman was late for breakfast because she was busy conducting the medical experiment reflotron. She made a biochemical analysis of her own "blood and that of the Mir station's residents crew of Musa Manarov and Viktor Afanasyev.

During the day, Sharman carried out the technological experiment "elektrotopograf" to study the degradation of dielectrical materials in raw space and test them, using an electrotopographic control method.

She especially likes the experiment "Vazon" aiming to study how little orchids and a dwarfish magnolia vine help improve the psychological atmosphere aboard the station.

The cosmonauts also continue other experiments envisaged by the joint Soviet-British flight's programme.

Afanasyev and Manarov, who will be relieved by Artsebarskiy and Krikalev, have begun preparing the Soyuz TM-11 spaceship for the return flight to earth. The former two and the British researcher are expected to land on Sunday, May 26.

Descent Vehicle Lands in Kazakhstan

LD2605121891 Moscow TASS in English 1201 GMT 26 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 26 TASS—Soviet cosmonauts Viktor Afanasyev and Musa Manarov and British cosmonaut-researcher Helen Sharman returned to Earth at 13.05 Moscow time today after completing the flight programme on board the orbital station Mir.

The Soyuz TM-11 spaceship's descent vehicle landed in a designated area in Kazakhstan, 68 kilometres southeast of the city of Dzhezkazgan. After landing, the cosmonauts are feeling well.

Work in space on board the orbital complex Mir is being carried on by the crew of the ninth long-duration expedition—Anatoliy Artsebarskiy and Sergey Krikalev.

During the eighth, 175-day, expedition, the cosmonauts continued work in the main fields of the research programme on board the complex Mir: astrophysics, technology, geophysics, biology and biotechnology.

The crew made four space walks. They installed and tested a telescopic jib intended for assembly operations on the outer surface of the orbital complex and carried out the planned repair and rehabilitation work.

A considerable part of the country's territory and individual areas of the world ocean were photographed for further study of the Earth's natural resources. Throughout the flight cosmonauts regularly measured fluxes of particles of cosmic origin in the near-Earth space.

The cosmonauts grew monocrystals of semi-conductor materials with improved characteristics and carried out experiments to further study the effectiveness of cultivating complex cellular cultures in zero gravity for their subsequent applications in medicine and pharmacology. They also carried out a cycle of experiments to gauge possibilities for creating credited life-support systems with the use of higher plants.

An example of developing Soviet-British cooperation in space exploration has been provided by Helen Sharman and the Soviet crews. During the flight Ms Sharman carried out a large amount of medico-biological research, and performed technological and biological experiments.

The results of work during the eighth expedition on board the permanently functioning orbital complex Mir will be utilised in various branches of science and the economy.

Cosmonauts Give Briefing

LD2705174191 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 27 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS—Despite 175 days in space Viktor Afanasyev and Musa Manarov, the crew of the eighth main expedition aboard the Mir space station, are in good shape and doctors okayed their participation in a brief news conference in Star City outside Moscow.

The two cosmonauts responded to "questions from Soviet and foreign journalists. The first British cosmonaut Helen Sharman, who also [words indistinct] news conference, looked fine both during her space mission and back on earth.

Deputy chief of the cosmonaut training centre General Alexey Leonov opened the news conference, as he had done before Anatoliy Artsebarskiy, Sergey Krikalev and Helen Sharman left for Baikonur. General Leonov noted that the cosmonauts had fully coped with the flight and research programmes. Viktor Afanasyev and Musa Manarov told journalists about impressions from their protracted mission. They described experiments in biology, bioengineering and technology that made up the bulk of their research efforts. Much time was devoted to the earth's visual observation and videorecordings.

Musa Manarov, who has spent more time in zero-gravity than any other man on earth, told journalists that his adaptation to weightlessness was ten times faster and easier than during his first, 365-day mission. His previous experience proved helpful.

Helen Sharman said that finding oneself in zero gravity turned out to be quite pleasant. She said she experienced no negative sensations. As for earth's gravity, she said her arm felt unusually heavy straight after the landing, but the feeling passed very quickly.

Speaking about her impressions from the flight, Sharman said the earth looked huge and beautiful. "It becomes immediately clear when you look at the earth from up there how we earthlings must take" care of it and cherish our earthly home".

Gorbachev Awards Cosmonauts

LD2605183791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 26 May 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] We have just received a decree by USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

For carrying out a space mission, Viktor Mikhailovich Afanasyev is being awarded the title Pilot Cosmonaut of the USSR. He is also being awarded the title Hero of the Soviet Union.

The order of the October Revolution is being awarded to Pilot Cosmonaut of the USSR Musa Khiramanovich Manarov, hero of the Soviet Union.

Cosmonaut-researcher Helen Sharman, citizen of Great Britain, is awarded the Order of Friendship of the Peoples.

Her backup, cosmonaut-researcher Timothy Mace, citizen of Great Britain, is also awarded the Order of Friendship of the Peoples.

Space Training Chief Criticizes British Sponsors

LD2605195191

[Editorial Report] Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian at 1351 GMT on 26 may broadcasts a 4.5-minute report from the Space Flight Control Center. The program begins with the presenter reminding listeners that cosmonauts Afanasyev, Manarov, and Sharman landed in Kazakhstan today. Correspondent Leonid Lazarevich then interviews Aleksey Arkhipovich Leonov, deputy head of the Gagarin cosmonaut training, who gives a preliminary evaluation of the flight. Leonov says: "The flight program which was confirmed beforehand has, according to our summary of operations, been fully carried out. Now all of this must be deciphered: everything that has accumulated, what they have brought back with them. Timewise, though, everything has been done as was programmed." He goes on to note that Afanasyev and Manarov had been working for 175 days in space: telemetric data on their program was regularly transmitted back to Earth, "and they have brought some material with them now," he says. "Sad to recall, however, that the part relating to ecology and other experiments recorded on tapes—I didn't even want to say, I don't want to believe that it has been lost, but the capsule has still not been found." This material, Lazarevich recalls, was in the Progress craft which was lost, although, he says Leonov still hopes it may turn up in a lake somewhere.

Lazarevich notes that this was the only flight "when the second country participating in the flight prepared virtually no experiments at all; I'm not counting the communications link with the schoolchildren,: he says, adding: "I am afraid that this has not added to the prestige of our space research, although Helen Sharman did of course work magnificently, and showed herself to be a really great girl."

Leonov reminds listeners of the history of the project: "When the program started, there were enough sponsors—as they are called now, that is, organizations which give money—on the British side. And we worked, and half of the money contracted was spent, and then, I don't know for what reasons, the sponsors got cold feet. We got to 1 January 1991, and the second half of the sum was not paid. One should not reckon everything in terms of money, there are some purely human relations, which are higher than all money, and then everything is compensated for. But is is bad that they did not put in any of their scientific equipment as was previously agreed, or they did not have time to do so, but their flight is completed."

Leonov concludes by noting that the two cosmonauts continuing on board the complex have a redocking ahead, and many space walks. The heaviest physical work they have to do is to move the solar batteries, weighing about 250 kilograms, from the equiment module and install it on the astrophysical module. Leonov says he has no doubt that the new crew will cope with their tasks, and in the first eight days of their flight have shown themselves to be feeling well.

Cosmos-2149 Launched by Soyuz Carrier 24 May

LD2505104791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1015 GMT 25 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 25 May (TASS)—Another artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-2149, which is destined to continue space research, was launched by a Soyuz booster rocket on Friday [24 May] in the USSR.

In addition to scientific apparatus, the satellite carries a radio system for the precise measurement of orbital elements, and a radiotelemetry system for transmitting data to earth about the work of the instruments and scientific apparatus.

The satellite has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution 89.7 minutes; apogee 377 km; perigee, 176 km; orbital inclination 67.2 degrees.

Military

Yazov Speech at Afghan Veterans Conference

PM2405113591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 May 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Our Army's Precious Asset. Speech by Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR Defense Minister," at the First All-Army Conference of Internationalist Servicemen in Moscow 22 May 1991]

[Text] The stage at which our country and our Armed Forces find themselves determines the special importance of today's conference. I would like to especially emphasize this. The conference cannot turn into just another showcase event. The very composition of its participants and the topic of discussion give us grounds to expect that the work to maintain and strengthen our society's and our Army's patriotic and internationalist potential will acquire a new quality.

I think that there is no need to adduce any special evidence to prove the necessity and importance of this work. Look at today's situation. National-separatist forces have come to life against the background of general socioeconomic crisis and exacerbated political confrontation in the country. The fatherland's history and our grandfathers' and fathers' labor and military deeds are being denigrated. Mass attacks are being launched against socialism, the Party, and the Army. A kind of ideological vacuum is emerging, and it is quickly filled by alien selfish ' values." Everything is being done to break the living bonds and continuity between generations of Soviet people, to deprive young people of correct guidelines for life.

In these conditions, ideas which rally and consolidate society, which drive people to work and to serve the fatherland with selflessness and dedication, are needed as much as the air that we breathe. This role can and must be played by the ideas of patriotism and internationalism.

Internationalist servicemen are the outstanding bearers of these ideas.

They are people with a sense of duty. They have proved their loyalty to the military oath, the people, and the motherland in the battlefield. This is the supreme criterion. They are people with a sense of commitment. The unbreakable unity between their words and deeds—a quality that is in acutely short supply today—has been repeatedly tested in combat conditions. They are people with a sense of honor. On Afghan soil, wherever else they have performed their soldier's duty, and in today's peacetime conditions, they have always served through conscience rather than through fear, they have worked wherever they have been assigned. To put it briefly, they are reliable people.

The motherland especially needs such people today, when the tasks of extricating the country from the crisis are being resolved. They are needed everywhere—in production, where there is an extreme need for discipline, organization, and the firm protection of democracy from speculators; in educational work, where attempts are being made to undermine society's moral foundations; in the defense sphere, where far-reaching reform measures are being implemented simultaneously with ensuring the Armed Forces' combat readiness and the country's security.

Comrade V.I. Varennikov noted in his report that there are about 68,000 internationalist servicemen in the Army's ranks at present. They command units, combined units, regiments, battalions, and companies; they train and educate their subordinates through the creative application of their combat experience.

I would like to name each and every one of them here. Unfortunately, this is impossible. Let me say only that the internationalist servicemen are indeed our Army's precious asset.

Another large detachment of internationalist servicemen is made up of officers, ensigns, sergeants, and soldiers of the reserve. Together with the war, labor, and Armed Forces veterans, they play an active part in young people's patriotic and internationalist education.

Associations and societies of internationalist servicemen have about 200,000 members at present. They have been set up at rayon level virtually everywhere in the country. The most fruitful work is done by associations and societies of internationalist servicemen in the Uzbek and Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], the Karelian ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], Kirov, Chernigov, and Minsk Oblasts, the cities of Barnaul and Nizhniy Novgorod, and many other regions in our country.

The activity of many societies and associations of internationalist servicemen concentrates increasingly often on the solution of social and daily life problems. This is, of course, exceptionally important and necessary. Efforts along this avenue must be boosted and aimed at achieving specific results. It is here that the individual approach should be not just a slogan, not just a call, but the fundamental underlying principle of internationalist servicemen's entire activity.

In this process, however, we cannot allow any slackening of heroic-patriotic work or of efforts to prepare young people for military service. Unfortunately, only 5-8 percent of internationalist servicemen today work with adolescents in military-patriotic clubs and associations. And yet there are more than 5,000 such clubs and associations in the country. They are a major force which, given a more purposeful and active participation

by internationalist servicemen, is capable of playing a tremendous role in ensuring patriotic continuity between generations.

Who else but internationalist servicemen, who have passed the harsh test of the crucible of war, are better suited to imbue young people with the right concepts of dignity and honor, of soldiers' friendship and military comradeship, of international brotherhood, of valor and courage?

Who else but internationalist servicemen, who have taken up the baton of heroic traditions from the frontline fighters of the Great Patriotic War, are better suited to do everything to ensure that these traditions are continued and augmented in the future?

The Soviet people's inherent feelings must be preserved. They include scorn for those who evade the performance of military duty. They include respect for the man in uniform, the serviceman and defender of the fatherland, respect for military service, and love for the beloved Army.

I think that this constitutes the paramount task of the day for internationalist servicemen. I have no doubt that it will be resolved with the most direct involvement of staffs, military-political directorates, military commissariats, and the command structures and collectives of combined units, units, and ships.

The situation of acute ideological struggle in society, when the role of "masters" of young people's minds and hearts is claimed by pseudodemocrats of the most diverse hues, when the people's defense awareness is being openly undermined, calls for a decisive expansion of the sphere of influence of the ideas of patriotism and internationalism.

What I mean, as regards the activity of internationalist servicemen, is primarily systematic, purposeful, and targeted work with young people of predraft and draft age.

Life calls for the discovery and bold application of new forms and methods here. I have no intention of presenting you with any prescriptions whatsoever—your experience, your initiative, and your imagination will certainly tell you what should be done and how it should be done in the specific circumstances.

But I cannot fail to mention that the defensive doctrine is not suitable here. To adhere to the slogans of "depoliticization," "departyization," or "deideologization" in this work means to knowingly court defeat.

Think of your own experiences in Afghanistan and of what it means to hold the commanding heights in combat! The same applies to ideological struggle. The only difference is that the heights here—in poet Vasiliy Fedorov's words—are men's hearts which must not be surrendered.

Meanwhile, it has to be admitted that we allow this to happen occasionally. Can we possibly accept our ongoing tolerance of the fact that the movement of soldiers' mothers, sacred in its conception and goals, was allowed to be taken over and exploited for selfish purposes by arrant timeservers and renegades from the so-called "Shchit?" Their anti-Army rantings and provocations, their encouragement of evasion of Army service, and their slander of internationalist servicemen are nothing but desecration of the memory of those who died on Afghan soil and of our common cause as a whole. Unfortunately, there are quite a few examples illustrating this.

The parliamentary rostrum, be it in Union and republic organs of power or at local soviet level, is utilized either insufficiently or not at all to promote the ideas of patriotism and internationalism in life. Think of how the country was stirred by the speech by "Afghan" Sergey Vasilyevich Chervonopiskiy at the Congress of People's Deputies! Unfortunately, at that time we failed to consolidate this flight of the people's patriotic spirit and found ourselves once more virtually fighting rearguard actions in the face of antipatriotic destructive forces emboldened by our organizational and political inertia.

The voice of internationalist servicemen can hardly be heard in the mass media. Some of these media—and you know them as well as I do—are following an obvious line of defaming the Armed Forces, slandering Army and Navy reality, cynically ridiculing the military labor and feats of internationalist servicemen, and denying the need for military duty and defense of the fatherland. And all this is camouflaged beneath slogans about "democracy," "glasnost," and "openness." I think that we must be more active, bolder, and more assertive in exposing the essence of this campaign.

Ultimately, the defense of the good name of those from whom we took over the battle standards, of the Army's traditions and glory, and of the sacred cause we are serving is a question of our military honor!

In view of the incessant attacks against Soviet military aid to Afghanistan and everything associated with our participation in the war on that country's territory, I cannot fail to say a few words about this problem.

Readiness to help countries in distress is an inherent feature of our people's character. Proof of this is provided by the 1,000 years of our fatherland's history, of which we are justifiably proud.

The introduction of the Soviet military contingent in Afghanistan, even though it was not contrary to the norms of international law, has been officially recognized as a mistake. Bearing in mind the changed specific historical conditions, this is a fair assessment.

But it is also fair to make the highest possible appraisal of the military labor and feats by servicemen who fittingly performed their combat tasks in rendering international assistance to the Afghan people.

All who have performed their military duty with dignity and honor and have graduated from the tough school of war in Afghanistan, Vietnam, Korea, and other countries deserve nationwide respect, gratitude, and concern.

This is expressed not only in the attitude of the overwhelming majority of Soviet people toward internationalist servicemen but also in state acts. I am talking about benefits in the sphere of education, provision of housing and transportation, and material and consumer services. Of course, much more remains to be done. And primarily to really help the invalids, our comrades in arms who especially need this help. Constant attention must be given to the families of all servicemen who have died in the performance of their international duty.

It is necessary to pool the efforts by organs of power, ministries and departments, and public organizations for unconditional implementation of the state program for improving internationalist servicemen's living conditions. The next step in solving this problem on a countrywide scale following this all-Army conference could be an All-Union Unification Conference of Internationalist Servicemen. It was said here that a coordinating center will obviously have to be created to prepare for it.

I would like to say in conclusion that all the speeches delivered here will be carefully studied. The suggestions that were made will also be implemented. I promise to do this. I would also like to remind delegates that in one month's time we will be marking the 50th anniversary of the day when fascist Germany attacked our country and the Great Patriotic War began. Soviet people defended their beloved land and brought liberation from fascism to Europe's peoples at the cost of unequaled military and labor feats, sacrifices, and privations.

The friendship of the country's peoples was one of the vital sources of our victory. This friendship fused Soviet people's patriotism and internationalism—the driving force of their mass heroism.

There are plans for large-scale celebrations in the country of the 50th anniversaries of all outstanding battles and events of the Great Patriotic War, including the 50th anniversary of victory in 1995. There is no doubt that internationalist servicemen will have to play an important role in this work, aimed at reviving and boosting the Soviet people's patriotic and internationalist spirit and at consolidating society.

Your tempering combat experience, your professional and moral qualities are called upon to stabilize society, cement the military ranks, and set an example for the new generations of internationalists patriots, reliable defenders of the fatherland.

Let me wish you good health, successful service, and happiness, as well as prosperity and well-being to those who have been discharged.

NATO, WEU Expansion Talk Undermines CSCE

PM2205153391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 May 91 First Edition p 5

[Colonel A. Vasilyev article: "Old Approaches to a New Europe"]

[Text] The last five years have been "productive" for Europe in terms of events of exceptional political importance: the signing of the Treaties on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles and Reductions in Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, German unification, and, lastly, the disbanding of the Warsaw Pact military structures. This means that there is just one military-political grouping left in Europe—the NATO bloc—instead of the two on whose existence the postwar system of regional security was based.

NATO experts assess the military disintegration within the Warsaw Pact as just a "domestic" problem for the Eastern bloc that will have no effect on the future of the North Atlantic alliance. That is, a trend has clearly emerged not only for the need to retain and further strengthen NATO to be justified in all manner of ways, but also for a new system of European security to be focused on it.

At present two areas—the Atlantic and the European—predominate as regards setting up such a system. The first is geared to NATO as the fundamental element in the future system, the second to the Western European Union [WEU]. At the same time specialists are now arguing with increasing frequency that these two areas can be combined.

The idea of creating a NATO-WEU axis is seen as the best option and is viewed positively by both "Europeanists" and "Atlanticists." It is thought that this would, first, help resolve the question of the North Atlantic alliance's forces operating outside Europe since the WEU could, to use NATO Secretary General M. Woerner's expression, "perform a separate role outside the alliance's zone of operations." Second, it is thought that NATO's "European pillar" could be reinforced via ties of association with the WEU for East European countries.

You get the impression that people in NATO are deliberately disregarding the CSCE or simply refuse to see it as the main element in a new nonbloc system of security comprising all countries in the region, including the Soviet Union. And if the conversation turns to the CSCE, it is largely to note the difficulties, for instance, involved in the institutionalization process, along with its amorphous structures and vague concepts.

Regrettably, East European countries also hew to the same position. On leaving the Warsaw Pact military organization they began to actively seek guarantees of their security outside the CSCE framework. One of the directions this quest has taken is bilateral and multilateral integration in Central Europe. This process began

with Czechoslovakia's signing an agreement with Hungary and Poland on military cooperation. Alongside this we can trace those countries' effort to create a "tripartite" alliance, one of the elements of which could be military cooperation.

The question of creating a regional "Centagonal" (pentagon) grouping—the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Italy, and Austria have already expressed a desire to take part—is also still being studied. Poland has also displayed an interest in joining. Some specialists reckon that it could in that case act as a link between the "pentagon" and the Baltic region countries.

Another area is rapprochement with NATO. At present the alliance is taking a very cautious approach to this question. It is thought to be a bad time and a hasty move to admit new members. And one that is even provocative toward the Soviet Union. Nevertheless there are people in NATO who admit the possibility of the USSR's former allies joining the alliance. Not right away. But via a system of consultations, the gradual broadening of military and diplomatic contacts, and associative forms of cooperation. Joining the WEU is regarded as a possible interim option for them.

These actions by NATO countries pursuing a policy of preserving bloc ties and the political maneuverings by East European states cast doubt on how seriously they take their pledges to create new structures of collective security in Europe, strengthen trust, and ensure equal security for everyone. The fact that such steps might undermine confidence in the disarmament movement also arouses misgivings.

News Conference on KGB Border Troops

OW2305053491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1130 GMT 22 May 91

[Text] Deputy in charge of KBG's border troops, General Nikolay Britvin, said additional 13,000 troops would be needed and 100 checking points set up as part of measures to implement the new Soviet emigration law (the total strength of KBG's border troops is put at 200,000 by early this year).

General Britvin at a news conference in Moscow on Wednesday said up to 2,500 illegal border-crossing offenders were detained annually of which 20-25

account for attempts by Soviet nationals to leave the country.

The general said the figure jumped to 28,000 cases last year because of massive illegal cross-border attempts on the Azerbaijani part of the Soviet border with Iran, leading to a total of 25,000 arrests. He did not rule out that a quantity of weapons smuggled in the country during the incident was being used by armed groups in Armenia and Azerbaijan

Baltic Republics

Yeltsin Takes 'Active Stand' for Baltics

LD2805092291 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 0400 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Boris Yeltsin, Russian Supreme Soviet chairman, announced that in the future too he will take an active stand for the peaceful regulation of the situation in the Baltics. He has contacted the leaders of all the Baltic states and subsequently informed Mikhail Gorbachev of his concern over present developments. The USSR president told Boris Yeltsin that, as far as it was known to him, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs had not given its command to conduct any armed actions in the Baltic republics. According to Boris Yeltsin, the president promised to give Boris Pugo, minister of internal affairs, corresponding instructions and to control the developments in the situation in the Baltics.

As it is known, a group of USSR and Russian deputies arrived yesterday at the Latvian Council of Ministers.

Russian TV Reviews Border Post Attacks

LD2805195991 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] [Announcer] Following the proof that OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] units attacked Lithuanian border posts, reports have now come in about a raid on the city market in Riga and also of large-scale movements in Latvia. All these events are very reminiscent of the scenario in mid-January this year, when there was a clear attempt, starting with the Baltic region, to turn the whole country to the right. I think that the attempts at destabilization are now being made at local level, by and large, and I am ready to believe something that no foreigner would believe: that Pugo, the minister of internal affairs, really did only find out about the gangsterism of the OMON units of armed men who are under him from the television program made by Aleksandr Nevzorov. Be that as it may, journalists of all persuasions have the right to function independently. But for Nevzorov, he [as heard] could not have revealed that in the Baltic region the OMON units have long transcended legal bounds.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent S. Dorenko] According to statements by Minister Pugo, the USSR Government is again—as in January—not monitoring the activities of the OMON units in the Baltic region. What is the president's view of the actions of the OMON units and how does he intend to deal with this problem?

[V. Ignatenko, spokesman of the USSR president] The president has not expressed his (?view). Minister of Internal Affairs Pugo set out the viewpoint of the Ministry of Foreign [as heard] Affairs and the viewpoint of the government regarding this conflict. I believe that [words indistinct]. [end recording]

[Announcer] There we have Ignatenko quoting Pugo, who in turn quotes Nevzorov. The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has declared OMON and similar militarized formations illegal, and ruled that their members are liable to criminal prosecution.

Pugo Says Border Post Attacks Justified

OW2905035191 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1530 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] The USSR Interior Minister Boris Pugo stated that OMON's [special purpose militia detachment] attacks on posts on the Latvian-Lithuanian border "in general, correspond with the task of law enforcement bodies to protect the interests of citizens and state". He expressed this opinion in a report submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet at a deputy's inquiry.

On May 23 and 24 the Riga and Vilnius OMON special units of the USSR Interior Ministry carried out operations to relieve the posts on the Latvian-Lithuanian border, B. Pugo reports. They were undertaken on the basis of the USSR law 'On the division of authorities between the USSR and members of the federation' according to which customs affairs are under the jurisdiction of central authorities.

However, B. Pugo acknowledges that the operations were accompanied by "insults of the republican servicemen and destruction of property". B. Pugo affirms that OMON acted "without the knowledge and order of the USSR Interior Ministry". He says groups of the USSR Interior Ministry's experts have been sent to Latvia and Lithuania for investigation. The Prosecutor of the Latvian republic has instituted proceedings against OMON on charges for abuse of power.

Savisaar Comments on Discussion With Pavlov

LD2805103691 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1700 GMT 27 May 91

[Interview with Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar by correspondent Jaan Raudsepp in Moscow on 27 May—recorded]

[Text] We will begin from Moscow. Today, Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar met USSR Government leader Valintin Pavlov. Jaan Raudsepp has asked Edgar Savisaar for an interview.

[Begin recording] [Savisaar] The key meeting today was the one with Valentin Pavlov, the USSR prime minister. It was a conversation of two hours. And I would put it like this, that we mainly discussed strategy issues. That means possible future scenarios for the USSR, its economic and political prospects; next, the situation which has been created by the one-plus-nine agreement, and the presidential election campaign in progress at present, as well as the progress of economic reform, of course, and its future, both the one planned on the part of the USSR Government as well as the one Estonia now wants to

implement. Among other things I also told him of our plans to change over to free prices for agricultural produce from the second half of the year, with the abolishing of the state order. And, of course, an essential subject of conversation was also the document from Tarasov, deputy chairman of the planning committee, which makes proposals to the Council of Ministers with respect to possible sanctions against the states which do not join the union treaty. This document is already fairly well known in Estonia.

We discussed the situation at the economic border, OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] activities, and possible ways of regulating relations altogether. Well, I would like to put it this way, that we agreed to continue this conversation in a week's time. It was a very frank and principled discussion. And what can one now say after the first stage? I think that we have managed to avoid economic sanctions by Moscow, and perhaps we also found some acceptable compromises on how to develop our relations further.

[Raudsepp] When you were talking about the OMON activity here, on Estonia's economic border, what was Mr. Pavlov's position then?

[Savisaar] We found jointly that any activity of this kind is not in any way strategically beneficial, not only to the Baltics but to the USSR central power, and Mr. Pavlov emphasized that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers is in no way associated with this. [end recording]

Estonia Said 'Willing To Buy' Independence

LD2805130291 Stockholm Radio Sweden in English 1130 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] In today's Nordic news, the foreign minister of the Baltic Republic of Estonia has said Estonia is willing to buy its independence from the Soviet Union. Estonian Foreign Minister Lennart Meri made the statement during a brief stopover in Stockholm on his way home from a visit in the United States. He told Swedish reporters the Estonian Presidential Council plans to offer the Soviet Union one billion U.S. dollars in hard currency as compensation for Soviet property, mainly public factories, in Estonia. The offer can be seen as the response to a Soviet Planning Ministry offer to grant Estonia and other republics independence if they buy back Soviet-owned property within their territory. According to Sweden's largest morning paper, DAGENS NYHETER, the Soviet Planning Ministry offer was made in an official document dated 8 May but which has been kept secret until today.

Lippmaa Resigns Over Narva Free Economic Zone

LD2805134691 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1200 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Minister Endel Lippmaa [in charge of relations with the USSR] handed in his resignation to Edgar Savisaar, chairman of the Republic of Estonia, this morning. This has been reported by ETA. In an interview given to ETA, Endel Lippmaa said that as work is being continued toward setting up a free economic zone at Narva, he cannot stay within the composition of the government. The minister claims the activity of the Estonian government on the Narva issue is in conflict with the Estonian Supreme Soviet's resolutions on independence, and that it will not bring any benefit to restoration of Estonian state independence and safeguarding its territorial unity.

Lippmaa said there is a zone being set up which will not be subject to Estonian laws. In a situation where one can expect pressure from the USSR on the issue of customs borders, another customs border is being artificially added. Results will be catastrophic, thinks Endel Lippmaa. Endel Lippmaa does not shut out the fact that the economic problems of northeastern Estonia must be resolved, but says that this must be done once Estonia's state independence has been restored. The present time is the worst for a free economic zone, finds the minister for the east, referring also to the dangers emanating from the One plus Nine agreement.

The final word on Minister Lippmaa's resignation will be with the Estonian Supreme Soviet. The minister for the east himself thinks that having retained the force of the government's 18 February resolution on the Narva free economic zone, the Supreme Soviet has already voiced its position.

'Congress of Estonia' Holds Session

LD2805210491 Tallinn Estonian Radio in English 2030 GMT 27 May 91

[Text] On Saturday the Congress of Estonia, a non-Soviet body representing legal citizens of the prewar independent Republic of Estonia, held its fifth session in Tallinn. The congress concentrated on economic themes and on the question of elections to a new Estonian parliament.

Congress delegates criticized the government for not moving fast enought toward a market economy and for not taking necessary steps to improve aspects of the overall economy.

Juri Adams, a delegate and member of the congress leadership, said that—quote—the government is preoccupied of pseudo-problems in the economy and is not moving forward on key issues. She also said that draft property and land laws are full of tricky paragraphs that would make returning land to former rightful owners as difficult as possible.

In an adopted resolution, the congress called on the government to take immediate measures to achieve privatization. In order to achieve this, the congress also said that a new parliamentary body should be elected and convened soon.

In the half-empty hall of the congress, which has lost significant popularity this last year for its apparent lack of power and ability to take constructive steps itself, many congress delegates criticized the congress for having taken too little action and for making too many speeches over its feared existence.

(Maido Kari), a delegate representing western Estonia and the chairman of the Estonian World Council, said in an interview with the Estonian news agency that—quote—the congress sessions have taken place too often and have been too poorly prepared. Said (Kari), if this continues, the question will emerge about whether the congress is needed at all. (Kari) claimed that all the initiative was now in the hands of the Estonian parliament and that the congress was lagging behind.

Soviet, Estonian Finance Ministers Reach Accord

OW2905040291 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1230 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] At a meeting Tuesday Soviet and Estonian Finance Ministers Vladimir Orlov and Rein Miller agreed to set up groups of experts for working out a financial accord between Estonia and the USSR.

In the opinion of specialists, the signing of such an accord would mean the end of the financial war between Estonia and the USSR which began after Estonia's refusal to pay the USSR more than 3 billion rubles (to the Union budget, the fund of economic stabilization, and the compensation fund).

Earlier, Estonia refused to transfer the first 178 million rubles to the union budget.

R. Miller believes the accord should establish a total sum of Estonia's payments to the Union budget and their destination. Estonia is ready to subsidize All-Union projects in oil industry, power engineering, machinery construction, but wants to have guarantees that it will receive the products of these industries, R. Miller points out.

R. Miller also said that Estonia is ready to pay about 160 million rubles to the Union budget this year while the USSR requires 732 million rubles.

"Estonia decided firmly that it would not pay a kopek either to the Soviet economic stabilization fund (600 million rubles) or the compensation fund (1640 million rubles)", R. Miller emphasized.

Latvian Prosecutor Defends OMON Border Actions

LD2805212691 Moscow TASS in English 2109 GMT 28 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga May 28 TASS—"The Riga OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] special task force's actions on the Latvian-Lithuanian economic border on Wednesday night were based on law," Valentin Daukshis, Latvian public prosecutor, told a briefing on Tuesday.

Baltic Transport Public Prosecutor Olgert Dzirlank agreed with this assessment.

OMON fulfilled a presidential decree on deblocking transport routes, and the Soviet customs code.

It was stressed that customs offices on inter-republics borders and the Latvian customs department were illegal. Since the Republic does not have a republican law on customs, it has to abide by the Soviet legislation.

Without giving assessments to specific incidents with OMON, the Soviet public prosecutors in Latvia pointed to the large number of complaints from citizens on customs officers.

The prosecutors drew the journalists' attention to cases that have yet to be investigated, including an incident when a customs office was set on fire long before a "black beret" unit arrived there.

Commenting on Soviet Interior Minister Boris Pugo's recent interview with the governmental daily IZVESTIYA, Daukshis said that Pugo had to ensure the implementation of the presidential decree and Soviet laws long ago. OMON acted in compliance with the law on Soviet police.

Daukshis said that while the Latvian legislature is discussing the text of a note to the national parliament and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in connection with the "criminal gang's" actions, "work to enforce law will continue".

Further confrontation will not contribute to the stabilisation in the Republic, he said.

Reports of Troop Movements Discounted

LD2805213191 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 1730 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] The command of the Baltic Military District has refuted the news that has appeared in the Latvian mass media on the movement of army units in Riga and its environs.

At the press center of the Baltic Military District it was explained to a LETA correspondent: The reports on the movement of columns of battle equipment in the Riga area, published by several mass media of the republic, are inventions and their aim is to incite rumors among the republic's inhabitants. The personnel of the Baltic Military District, including the units of the Riga garrison, are at their permanent stations, where a planned exercise is taking place.

'Alarming Events' in Baltics Reviewed

LD2805105291 Riga Radio Riga International in Latvian 1930 GMT 27 May 91

[Text] As we promised, comments on last week's quite alarming events connected with the activities of the USSR internal affairs troops.

As we have already reported, after a longer quiet spell violent actions have again begun in Latvia. On 22 and 23 May the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs special task unit, also called the Black Berets, occupied the Latvian Republic transport militia administration duty section and demolished five customs posts. On Friday evening one more customs post was demolished at Eleja In turn, on Saturday the people of Riga were alarmed by movements of Soviet Army armored personnel carrier columns in the streets of Riga. This battle equipment was said to have been involved in exercises, although the Latvian Government already had an old agreement about any exercises in the Latvian Republic, specifically that the government and inhabitants would be informed.

When special unit combatants were demolishing the customs posts they beat up the customs workers and deprived them of all property. The customs posts were burned down. The customs workers were also deprived of documents. According to provisional data, the customs posts were damage to the extent of 200,000 rubles. The situation also favored the attackers because there is no means of communications between the customs posts. The Latvian Customs Department has not had until now sufficient means to provide the posts with communications systems.

The Latvian Republic Government has sent a telegram addressed to Gorbachev, Pavlov, and Pugo. It emphasizes that this provocative action in Latvia and the extensive use of internal affairs troops testifies to this being an action which has been thoroughly planned and approved at the center. At the same time the leaders of the parliament, government, and ministries of Latvia have been sent anonymous letters containing threats of terrorist acts against them.

In organizing these violent attacks last week it must be assumed that this conflict was stimulated by the USSR Customs Code published in IZVESTIYA on 19 April, although it only comes into force on 1 July this year. Likewise, a connection can be seen between the talks between the Latvian Republic and the USSR delegations held on 23 May and these acts of violence.

I will remind you that the USSR delegation at the last moment refused to come to the talks, but did not inform us officially about this. They announced it over the telephone.

It is possible that the USSR leaders are endeavoring to delay the talks with the Baltic republics and will endeavor to delay them even until the moment the union treaty envisaged in July is concluded.

In connection with all these events in Latvia, on Friday a republican Supreme Council Presidium sitting took place. There a statement of protest to the USSR Government was adopted and it categorically demands the prevention of terror actions committed by the USSR Ministry of Intenal Affairs troops against the Baltic republics, and likewise the investigation of these crimes and it demands compensation for the damage caused.

We have not succeeded in informing USSR Minister of Internal Affairs Boris Pugo over the telephone about the demolished customs posts in the Republic of Latvia. His deputies, in turn, have said that this question is not within their competence. In turn, the attacks themselves at the customs posts have substantiated their action with an order by the USSR president.

It must furthermore be added that during the destruction of the customs posts, in addition to the Black Berets, Leningrad Television journalist Aleksandr Nevzorov, who is already known to many, was present with a video camera and filmed everything that took place. Excerpts of the film he prepared were shown last Friday by Latvian Television. In these assembled sequences, fortunately, the attackers' aggressiveness and jeering at the customs workers were not concealed.

It can be added too that in today's IZVESTIYA USSR Minister of Internal Affairs Boris Pugo said that in the conflicts at the Latvia and Lithuania border customs posts the USSR internal affairs troops were not involved.

Well, then it only remains to reflect on who is really right? The minister, or the television reporter Nevzorov who has visually filmed the Black Berets in action?

At present the Latvian customs points on the borders with Belorussia and Lithuania are again in operation. The Latvian Republic Government and parliament have adopted a resolution on forming a nonviolent defense center, on strengthening militia posts on the republic's borders, and guarding objects of importance to the state. In the nearest future the Latvian Republic Council of Ministers will examine the question of improving the Latvian Republic customs service activities and its material and technical provisions.

The Lithuanian Supreme Council at its sitting today discussed the need to strengthen security at customs posts. Vytautas Landsbergis emphasized that posts in Estonia which were armed and ready to offer resistance were not attacked by the USSR militarists.

At a sitting today of the Latvian parliament People's Front faction Talavs Jundzis, head of the commission for defense and internal affairs, proposed to draw up a note to the USSR Supreme Soviet and Government so that tomorrow it can be adopted at the parliament's plenary sitting.

Lithuanians Urged 'Not To Yield to Provocations'

OW2905032591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 0930 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] On Monday, the parliament of Lithuania adopted a resolution on the special police units (OMON) and other Soviet formations, and on their actions against the Lithuanian Republic and its citizens.

The resolution was adopted following the recent attacks of OMON units on Lithuanian border-guard posts, and says that the entire responsibility for them rests with the Soviet leadership which is "thus trying to destabilize the situation in the republic."

The republic's law-enforcement bodies have been instructed to take additional measures to ensure that such crime be objectively investigated and their organizers tried and punished.

The government of Lithuania has been instructed to enhance the protection of the republic's borders, and to restore and strengthen the border-guard and customs posts previously destroyed.

It is the duty of the local self-government bodies to give every assistance to the national defense and customs departments in order to bring the work of the border guard and customs posts back to normal."

On the same day, the Lithuanian parliament adopted an appeal to the citizens and residents of the Lithuanian Republic, urging them not to yield to provocations, and asking the OMON fighters "to stop their criminal activity, to ignore orders and quit their service so as not to be criminals."

Landsbergis Criticizes Baltic Community

OW2905075891 Moscow BALTFAX in English 0930 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] In an interview to the Lithuanian magazine, SVET (THE GLOBE), Chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, Vytautas Landsbergis, criticized the community of the Baltic republics.

"The Baltic community would have been politically stronger today if all of the Baltic countries had more or less clear and unambiguous positions on matters of self-determination and on the state status," he said. "Unfortunately, there is no such thing at the moment."

In his opinion, historically, all of the Baltic republics are illegally annexed states.

"But today, some of the Baltic states can still be viewed as part of the USSR, as republics which have not yet clearly defined their political status," he said.

Mr. Landsbergis believing there is no unanimity in the policy of some of Lithuania's neighbours.

The question of our common position is becoming conventional. We are making efforts to keep the Baltic front together. But this is no easy to do," he said.

RSFSR

Fourth RSFSR Peoples Deputies Congress Viewed

PM2805114591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Yevgeniy Sorokin: "Power Changes Again"]

[Text] It is difficult and indeed even dangerous to investigate present political stratagems. The poor Soviet man in the street who only a few years ago took pride in the stability of the situation in the country has probably already lost his head completely. In order now to avoid the reputation of a retrograde or conservative you have to follow the example of grandfather Nechipor in "Wedding in Malinovka" ["Svadba v Malinovke"] and constantly keep two hats ready—"for the reds" and "for the whites." His comical "Ah, power is changing again" is becoming a dramatic reality of our existence.

Just a year has elapsed since the first Russian congress. A year filled with events which still await consideration and in-depth analysis. A year of the consolidation of Russian statehood and the political establishment of the republic's leaders. A year, seemingly, of fatal differences between them and the center and of promising conciliation. And, it must be admitted, a year of these leaders' "power saturation," essential so that after this "satiety," they can think calmly about what to do next.

During this year—from the first congress to the fourth—Russia's deputies corps has been substantially transformed. The past congress is confirmation of that. Beginning with the fact that, to the surprise of many, there were no empty verbal disputes and no arrogant political clashes at it. Actually, that was to be expected. After all the professional fighters from the "Democratic Russia" group believing, as we can see, that happiness is in struggle, on this occasion essentially had no one against whom to struggle.

Their main opponent—the "Communists of Russia" bloc—split at the third congress. And B. Yeltsin, aware, to judge by his statements of recent months, that the CPSU is by no means "a colossus with feet of clay," took with him a goodly proportion of Russian Communists, nominating for the post of vice president A. Rutskoy, leader of the "Communists for Democracy" group. The apathy of the "Communists of Russia" was obviously also promoted by recent newspaper items by leaders of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party with which they merely damaged the prestige of a party which only recently was the vanguard of political forces and the herald of the new thinking. In one thing at any rate Boris Nikolayevich is right: The present leaders of the conservative wing in the party are trying to do what is frankly impossible in order

to promote the consolidation of the positions of "Democratic Russia." That is why the voice of the Communists was not so weighty at the congress.

The congress resolved, and within the planned schedule, almost all questions on the agenda. The law on the presidency was approved, changes were introduced to the Russian Constitution, and important reports, both planned and unprepared, were heard. A new holiday was instituted: Henceforth 12 June will be a leave day. Only one question was not resolved—the question of the Constitutional Court. But again it was promised that in June this problem will be exhausted at the congress, when the new president will be sworn in.

And so Russia is entering a new phase. To be honest, it is starting not exactly not to feel itself but to feel a certain malaise. The Russian president is invested with very great powers. God forbid that the words of Deputy S. Baburin to the effect that they are almost dictatorial powers should be prophetic. After all there is also the question of the hands into which they will fall.

Only now, probably, has a great deal become comprehensible to those who during the Russian referendum delightedly voted for the introduction of the institution of the presidency. They voted without knowing what for! Just as the deputies who signed the demand that this referendum be held did not know.

The Russian parliamentarians have become hostage to their own lack of principle. They would have done well if, after the Russians had voted, albeit "in the dark," for the institution of the presidency, they had started to "topple" the law on the presidency! But what can they do now—you do not brandish your fists after the fight, especially as the cautious "Communists of Russia" have a minority in parliament and at the congress.

I think it is appropriate here to think once again about the reasons for this situation. As representatives of the ruling and only party in the country, the Communists lost the qualities of fighters. That is on the one hand. On the other, their own punctiliousness and intellect did them a disservice. They consider it beneath their dignity to conduct polemics as the representatives of "Democratic Russia" do quite often. Actually, they would simply not be allowed to do so—the microphone would be switched off. On the other hand the "Democrats" have allowed themselves a mocking tone, tactlessness, and political demagoguery—all means were good to disavow their political rival.

But the train has already left, as the saying goes, and the question of the presidency has been decided. But politics is such a merciless "item" that in it you may even find yourself unceremoniously in the claws of a lion who only yesterday the delighted forest inhabitants were "calling to rule the kingdom." As the author of this analogy says in another fable, "we hear many examples of this in history."

In that sense it is as though some fate loomed over Russian history. In a country which for centuries has lived under monarchs or tyrants there should without fail be a powerful opposition. The democratic gains are still so immature and are still so unaccustomed in the people's awareness that there is no guarantee that the "Communist" dictatorship will not be replaced by a "democratic" dictatorship.

What am I talking about? About how Russia's salvation from dictatorship lies in the existence of two opposing political blocs. Salvation in the fact that for the time being (but only for the time being!) there is a chance of electing a "Communist" as chairman of the Supreme Soviet as a counterweight to a "democratic" president and vice versa.

I am sure that such zealous "democrats" as Nosovets, Kurkova, and Starovoytova will treat this warning with contempt. Only after all our life in Russia is painfully changeable. Only one thing has remained unchanged in Russian leaders: Having assumed the "throne" they have for some reason rushed primarily to rid themselves of those who helped them the most.

It was obvious that even during the congress there was something the deputies did not like. Perhaps it is only my feeling but it seems to me that once again it was the ubiquitous S. Shakhray who spoiled the "music." Even without that it is already suspicious that the chairman refused a post to one more deputy chairman when, after several "runs," the deputies did not elect S. Shakhray to the post. And he also spoke of instituting a constitutional court. With almost divine powers. And he claimed he would be guided "by the Constitution and his conscience."

As far as conscience is concerned, especially "one's own" conscience, as is well known that is a loose concept. So the deputies decided simply to make themselves secure: Let's see how the first president of the Union's "backbone" behaves after being elected. And then let the new chairman of the Supreme Soviet suggest the composition of the constitutional court, they said. And they were right.

Because Boris Nikolayevich, before the strains of the Russian anthem had died away at the press conference after the congress, stated that "we shall return at the Supreme Soviet" to the question of the president's party allegiance. Well I never! The congress has only just voted against the president suspending his party membership for the duration of his powers and they intend to dispute its decision in parliament. Is there not such certainty because the Supreme Soviet has already become "tame?" And the powers of the congress, parliament, the chairman, and the presidium were so confused at the third congress that no one will now understand who is responsible for what?

In this connection a very fundamental question arises. The residistribution of powers was conceived as a temporary measure until the introduction of the institution

of the presidency. But now that things are completely clear regarding the presidency should the former decision probably not be repealed? That has not happened, however, and it is unclear now whether the Supreme Soviet will in a number of cases take the place of the congress or not?

But perhaps this has all been left specially like this. B. Yeltsin will become president and the chairman will be a man from his "team" and when the opportunity arises it will be possible to turn matters in the necessary direction? Everything here is so unpredictable that you are amazed: Where are eminent legal experts like S. Shakhray looking?

Russia is entering a new period of its development. The presidential race has already begun on an almost "American" scale. All the contenders approved at the congress are promising the poor Russians a high degree of prosperity, peace, and protection. People have already grown tired of the promises, just as they have grown sick of the political struggle. It is therefore difficult to say to which of the six presidential candidates they will give their preference. At any rate perhaps not only V. Zhirnovskiy is a "dark horse" and even he will obviously reveal himself during the election campaign. The other five are before everyone's eyes—in deeds and in words. It is the one whose program seems not only feasible but also peaceful who will probably win. That is the program in which the word "center" will be uttered with the same respect as the word "sovereignty." At any rate that is the candidate I will vote for.

Final Stages of Congress Reported

PM2805154991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 May 91 First Edition p 1

[RosTASS report: "Russian: Elections Ahead"]

[Text] After two hours of intensive debate parliamentarians rejected the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Law "On the RSFSR Constitutional Court," whose text had earlier been adopted by the republic Supreme Soviet. Further work will be done on it, after which it will be submitted for discussion by the next congress of Russian people's deputies.

R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, spoke about the Russian leadership's determination to complete work on the preparation of a new Union treaty in the very near future. He reported on the progress of work on the draft Union and Federative Treaties.

One of the main problems in concluding the Union treaty, according to the speaker, has been the procedure governing its signing by the republics comprising the Russian Federation. The need for the document to be signed by republics represented by delegations approved by their supreme soviets and forming part of a general Russian delegation was finally acknowledged. Thus, the first signature under the document will be that of the RSFSR, followed by the constituent republics in alphabetical order. This procedure, the deputy head of the parliament stated, "suits everybody except Tatarstan."

Then B.N. Yeltsin commented on the results of the 24 May session of the preparatory committee to finalize the draft Union treaty. He said that "an improved version of this document" was submitted and "an interesting and constructive discussion took place."

All the participants in the meeting were practically unanimous that the document's name will refer to a "Union of Sovereign States," he stressed. The sides agreed to retain the abbreviation used for the name of the state—the USSR—while changing its thrust by proposing "Union of Sovereign Soviet Republics." "This will be a federal state, not a confederation," he stressed.

In the words of the leader of the Russian parliament, it was decided to collate the improved version of the treaty with the remarks made on it, have another meeting at Federation Council level, and then release it to the republics' supreme soviets so that the document can be ready for signing in June.

The deputies heard a report about the situation in Azerbaijan and Armenia. Deputy F.V. Shelov-Kovedyayev presented a report on the results of an RSFSR Supreme Soviet delegation's visit to the area. The floor was then given to Human Rights Committee Chairman S.A. Kovalev, who informed the congress about the first phase of this committee's hearings into the question of the armed conflict in Azerbaijan and Armenia.

The deputies resumed their previous day's discussion of the North Ossetian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet appeal to the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman was tasked with personally supervising the implementation of the law on the rehabilitation of repressed peoples in accordance with the Constitution.

The deputies were briefed on the examination of the appeal to the congress from soldiers' mothers. The Supreme Soviet was tasked with studying the problems spelled out in the letter and adopting appropriate decisions.

The congress declared 12 June—the day the Declaration of Russia's State Sovereignty was adopted in 1990—to be a nonworking day.

The congress is over. As B.N. Yeltsin said, the congress took place in a businesslike spirit. Albeit gradually, a process of the consolidation of deputies on a constructive basis is taking place.

Yeltsin Visits Murmansk Navy, Civilian Units

LD2805164591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Networkin Russian 1349 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] [Announcer] Now, a call from the town of Murmansk to our Panorama program. Here is journalist Yuriy Filipov.

[Filipov] Good day.

[Announcer] I know we are talking on our Panorama about the visit to the north by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin.

[Filipov] Yes, but I will start my short report on the visit by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin to our oblast with the statement which he made to journalists at the airport immediately on arrival by air in Murmansk. Boris Nikolayevich asked us to note that his visit to Kola was not an election trip by a candidate for the post of president of Russia and that his meetings with the northerners would be purely businesslike affairs at which he intends to discuss the Russian progam for the development of the northern regions of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. At this very moment one of those meetings is getting under way at the Murmansk fishermen's palace of culture and technology.

Now a few words about Boris Nikolayevich's visit to our region today: This morning he and the people accompanying him laid flowers on the pedestal of the monument to the defenders of the Soviet polar region and paid tribute with one minute's silence to those who perished defending the most northerly bounds of our homeland in the years of the Great Patriotic War. After that the chairman of the Russian parliament visited Severomorsk and met members of the military council of the Red Banner Northern Fleet. During Boris Nikolayevich's visit to the nuclear missile-carrier Kirov, there was a bit of an unpleasant incident. While the protocol part of the meeting was precisely observed—Boris Nikolayevich inspected the guard of honor of Severomorsk servicemen—precisely five minutes after he had gone into the ship's mess, where the seamen and journalists had gathered, we were suddenly asked to leave by some civilian, who announced that this was a requirement of the commander of the Northern Fleet. It was learned later that the commander had not given any such order, and moreover this was done so that the whole body of journalists covering the meeting could get as much information as possible, so, unfortunately, there are no details in my notebook about the questions from the Northern Fleet seamen answered by Boris Nikolayevich.

Boris Nikolayevich visited one other Murmansk enterprise today. This was the experimental protein preparations works of the Murmansk fish combine. Here the main body of the workforce is made up of women, and of course the whole conversation dealt with women's topics, concerning heavy manual labor in the workshops, the lack of provision of housing and children's preschool institutions and much, much more. In short, there were many questions, and in answering them Boris Nikolayevich said that he had brought to Murmansk a package of proposals including answers to the majority of problems worrying the northerners.

Once again I would repeat that now, at the moment, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's meeting with deputies to the local soviets, public representatives and economic organizations is starting.

[Announcer] Well, I know that the journalists, including our own correspondent, are now at that meeting.

[Filipov] Yes, Valeriy is at that meeting right now, and perhaps we will get his material on the Vremya program today.

[Announcer] Well, thanks. I remind you that this was a report on the visit by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, to Murmansk Oblast.

Well, the leadership of our editorial office deem it necessary to add this postscript to that: We are grateful for the material we have had from our own correspondent Valeriy Anuchin and the journalist Yuriy Filipov and the TASS correspondents. However, we would note that the Russian Supreme Soviet's press service did invite a special Mayak correspondent to provide fuller coverage of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's working trip but at the last moment we at the radio station got a phone call from Viktor Alekseyevich Yugin, chairman of a committee of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and were told that our correspondent was being excluded from the journalists accompanying the chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet. A somewhat strange approach to an important matter, which can only give rise to bewilderment. I myself would like to add that there could hardly be any kind of intention here, it more likely stems from organizational and technical reasons. I know that the committee on the media, which Comrade Yugin heads, pays great attention to the operations of the All-Union Television and Radio Company and to Mayak in particular. Various questions addressed to its leadership do not always receive responses.

Visits Nuclear Cruiser Kirov

OW2905040991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] On a tour of Russia's north, on Tuesday the chairman of Russia's parliament Boris Yeltsin arrived at the Severomorsk base of the Northern Fleet and visited the nuclear-capable cruiser Kirov. The anthems of the USSR and of the Russian Federation were performed on board the ship in his honour.

The nuclear-powered cruiser Kirov was built 10 years ago. One of the world's most powerful naval ships with an unlimited range, it is equipped with all types of modern weapons. It inherited its name from the celebrated cruiser Kirov which was launched in 1935 and which was operational till 1974.

Boris Yeltsin met with spokesmen for the squadron's officers and sailors who drew his attention to their hard socioeconomic situation.

The fleet's personnel, he was told, is tormented by endless agricultural works. Food supplies for the sailors are unsatisfactory. Food deliveries are carried out in full only by Lativa and Estonia, and partly by the Russian Federation, while the Ukraine and Lithuania stopped their food supplies altogether. The state of affairs in the building of housing, childcare centers, schools, and public services is also unsatisfactory.

'Opposition to Nucleas Tests' Cited

OW2905035891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Boris Yeltsin, Chairman of the Russian republic's Supreme Soviet, began his tour of the North of Russia on Monday. Landing in the airport of Murmansk he said the tour was not part of his election campaign, but a preplanned business trip. "Too many problems have accumulated in the North".

Yeltsin is expected to sign an important agreement in the city of Severomorsk on economic development of the Northern part of Russia.

On Tuesday Yeltsin is scheduled to visit the Northern Fleet base in Severomorsk, meet high ranking navy officers and tour the cruiser "Kirov". In the evening he will depart for the capital of Karelia—Petrozavodsk.

Answering a question from journalists Yeltsin reiterated his opposition to nuclear tests in the North of Russia.

Approves Economic Experiment

LD2805192391 Moscow TASS in English 1849 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Murmansk May 28 TASS—After meetings with residents of the Soviet Arctic city of Murmansk, Chairman of the Russian Parliament Boris Yeltsin headed for the region's other major industrial cities.

During his meetings with representatives of working collectives and the public in Murmansk region, Yeltsin signed two documents, one of which aims to improve the social and political situation in northern Russia.

The other document enables the region to carry out an economic experiment to make the region economically more independent.

Both documents reflect the Russian leadership's desire to decentralise the Republic's economy and increase the role of local governing councils in solving basic social problems.

Yeltsin's Election Mate Justifies Platform

LD2805173391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1410 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] The Russian presidential candidates are meeting their voters today, but the candidates for the post of vice president have a strenuous program of election campaign meetings, too. Aleksandr Vladimirovich Rutskoy, who will be vice president if Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin wins, held a news conference in the House of the Soviets. We discovered that Rutskoy is about to visit Barnaul—where he graduated from the Higher Air Force Training college—then Altay Kray, Novosibirsk, Krasnoyarsk, Irkutsk, Lipetsk, Orel, Kursk, his homeland, and most likely Krasnoyarsk, too. Yesterday Aleksandr Vladimirovich was in Zagorsk, at the monastery. As he said, it is the custom in Russia to obtain the blessing of the church before an important task.

Is a military dictatorship possible in Russia, asked the correspondents, particularly the foreign ones, worried probably by the fact that the candidates for the high office include many who are members of the military. There never has been nor will there ever be that kind of thing in Russia whatever the reason replied military airman Rutskoy. Listen to his replies to two questions, one by our correspondent Lyudmila Semina:

[Begin recording] [Semina] Many presidential candidates are promising the people lots of social benefits. What is your opinion? Is there enough money in our treasury to promise everything to everyone and if there isn't enough money is there nevertheless any realistic way of improving living standards?

[Rutskoy] I dealt with social problems in the Russian Federation and it is indeed my work on these problems over the course of a year that has led me to thinking in this particular way because solutions must be found. Promises, you know, are far from everything. Many things have been promised in our country over 74 years but in real terms the result is virtually this: that an enormous mass of people—and the figure is on the order of 70 million people—has found itself below the poverty line, meaning that properly speaking they are poverty-stricken people. How can society be described as socialist? How can one talk of a Communist prospect? The fund for the social development of Russia has been set up upon the initiative of our committee. It is a state and public fund having a commercial structure, a banking structure and a financial and trade structure. The purpose and task of this fund is to participate with the government in implementing social programs by using waste raw-materials resources—secondary raw materials—and in this respect we are providing correct solutions to both the ecological problem and at the same time we are earning money for investment and for social programs. A whole package of social programs has been worked out. And you know when we started to analyze what the fund is capable of in the sense of implementing these programs the situation here looks fairly gloomy, you know, because we aren't in a position to cover all our

social problems that virtually no one has ever dealt with. In addition—and this is once again at our initiative—there is going to be a congress of Russian business circles on the third [month not specified] at the Kosmos Hotel. We will continue looking and searching. I have been talking to Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. There has been a massive influx of telegrams and there was a meeting in the election campaign and these indicate that pensioners are making one and the same request; that the prices of milk, milk products, bread and fish, in other words the prices of the basic foodstuffs bought by the pensioner should be reduced. Therefore we are now going to consider this problem. Boris Nikolayevich will be coming back from his tour. But you know raising all these prices wholesale without taking into consideration the lowest strata of our population, especially those incapable of work quite simply isn't a serious way of doing things either. A person has to eat something. It's fine moving toward the market, but one must always remember that there are people who are incapable of earning. A draft law on social guarantees for invalids has now been prepared. That category of citizens is the odd man out in our society.

[Unidentified correspondent] What has brought about your transition—your sharp transition, shall we say—to the democratic forces?

[Rutskoy] There is a mistaken opinion currently both in our own population and also abroad. Why? I have never—I stress this and say it once again—I have never changed my convictions or my stance. For this I have the arguments and the facts: my campaign for election as USSR people's deputy; I have the election program from when I was standing for people's deputy of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic; and way back in 1988 I voiced some quite sharp criticism of Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, although in those days as you are perfectly well aware not everyone would have dared to do such a thing. I criticized him today for the same omissions. I see myself in the future—whether they elect me or not—I see myself nevertheless dealing with the social problems of our citizens. You must understand, it's impossible to describe a state either as a law-governed state or especially as a socialist stae if the problems of the individual are not resolved. The fixed direction of my activity took place as a consequence of my having worked for a year, for a whole year, as chairman of the Supreme Soviet committee for the affairs of invalids, veterans of war and labor and internationalist servicemen and also for the affairs of servicemen and the members of their families. My position here is therefore as follows: The state must guarantee the individual his right to be a person. [end recording]

Ryzhkov: 'Military Reform Lags Behind'

LD2805150191 Moscow TASS in English 1443 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—"The Russian Federation's military policy should be pursued within the framework of a single state policy of a renewed union," Nikolay Ryzhkov said. At a meeting with soliders from the Moscow garrison, as reported by today's KRASNAYA ZVEZDA newspaper, the candidate for Russian Presidency noted that, in his view, military reform lags behind other reforms.

"The strategic situation for the country, the union republics and for the Soviet armed forces has changed significantly. The dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty's military structure failed to prompt NATO to take adequate steps. This fact was not fully taken into account in the treaty on conventional forces in Europe," Ryzhkov stressed.

He said it was necessary to define clearly the goals, content and principles of military policy, the fire power and strength of the Soviet armed forces to meet the requirements of the military doctrine and really guarantee the protection of the state's interests, its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Ryzhkov noted that the anti-army campaign was indisputably politically-tinged. Those who are whipping up this campaign are putting the people, the army and various categories of servicemen in opposition, are trying to demoralise and neutralise the army. Without understanding the consequences of these actions, they are pursuing purely selfish and anti-people goals.

On social problems faced by the armed forces, Ryzhkov noted that they had long been neglected and proposed expanding house construction with the funds and forces of the Soviet Defence Ministry, converting military capital construction to these needs and allowing house-building cooperatives to allocate free loans to retired servicemen for these purposes.

Addresses Voters in Krasnodar

PM2805130191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 May 91 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Meeting With the Electorate"]

[Text] Moscow—"If I am elected president, the whole political system will be aimed at cleansing the country of filth, red tape, and a barrack-style existence," N.I. Ryzhkov promised during his meeting with the electorate in the Krasnodar "Podmoskovye" Palace of Culture. The former chairman of the Council of Ministers stated that perestroyka has not taken place in its intended form. According to the candidate for the presidency, the framework of a mighty state started being taken apart under the guise of reform. It was said that "he fought the politickers who tried to push perestroyka off track; he fought them in the Politburo and in the Supreme Soviet. The people who must determine the republic's economic policy are neither the politickers nor the experts from the 'big seven,' but professional economic managers."

His electoral strategy consists in campaigning for the votes of effectively all the social categories, and the main

theses of the program are as follows: the immediate signing of the Union and Federative treaties; the elaboration of a special legislative act, which would clearly establish the position of the Russian Federation and defend the rights of the Russian-speaking population outside its borders; the indexation of earnings; the reduction of prices of basic food products and basic necessities, particularly goods for children; and the boubling of earnings for workers employed in the state sector.

Candidate Tuleyev Aims To Fight Criminal World

LD2905042491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 28 May 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast—read by announcer]

[Text] Aman Gumirovich Tuleyev has begun his electoral meetings with voters in the Kuzbass. The meetings were attended by representatives of other regions in Siberia. The people of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] themselves gave me the action program, the candidate said at one of the meetings. What do they need today? They want every person to feel that he is an individual. For this it is necessary to give people the opportunity to earn, removing all restrictions. The second thing, the contender continued, is that the people of the RSFSR must regain their confidence in tomorrow. Since that confidence is lacking, more often than not because of rising crime, I would start my work as president by fighting the criminal world, Aman Gumirovich Tuleyev noted.

Supports Privatization, Union Treaty

LD2905082191 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—The establishment of free enterprise zones and broad economic powers to regions in the Russian Federation will ensure the republic's economic upsurge, believes chairman of the Kemerovo regional council Aman Tuleyev.

He is one of the six candidates running for the post of Russian president. The elections will be held on June 12.

Other candidates include president of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin, member of the Soviet Security Council Vadim Bakatin, former Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, leader of the Liberal Democratic Party of the Soviet Union Vladimir Zhirinovskiy and General Albert Makashov.

Tuleyev was nominated for the Russian executive Presidency soon after the country's largest coalminers' strike this spring.

Over 340,000 signatures (under the election law, a candidate for the Russian Presidency needs to collect at least 100,000 signatures to be registered) were collected in his support in the Kuznetsk coal basin, a major coal-mining region in the country.

The presidential hopeful believes that "it is necessary to carry out privatisation in all economic sectors except the basic industries". In his opinion, this will give a free hand to producers, stabilise the econony and give impetus to economic growth.

The signing of a new union treaty by union republics, as well as by republics, members of the Russian Federation, is an important condition for this stabilisation and growth, Tuleyev believes.

In addition, the candidate claims that "it is necessary to transfer all legislative power to parliament and to simplify the system of councils".

As for relations between the Russian Federation and other union republics, Tuleyev favours the conclusion of long-term political and economic treaties with them. He also supports the development of advantageous relations with any states in the world according to norms and principles of the United Nations.

Interviewed With Bocharov

PM2805155191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 May 91 First Edition p 3

[Interview with candidate for Russian presidency Aman-Gelda Moldagazyyevich Tuleyev and candidate for vice president Viktor Ivanovich Bocharov, by A. Gamov under the rubric "Before the Presidential Elections in Russia"—date and place of interview not given; first paragraph is introduction: "To Sow Hope"]

[Text] After B.N. Yeltsin visited Kemerovo Oblast at the end of April and beginning of May, where he signed a decree on the transition of the republic coal industry to Russian jurisdiction, and after he collected several tens of thousands of signatures in support of his nomination for the post of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president, an unexpected report was made to the effect that over 270,000 workers from the Kuzbass had nominated another contender for this post—RSFSR People's Deputy Aman-Gelda Moldagazyyevich Tuleyev, chairman of the Kemerovo Oblast Soviet. RSFSR People's Deputy and Hero of Socialist Labor Viktor Ivanovich Bocharov, chief of the "Kuzbasshakhtostroy" Combine, has been registered as candidate for the post of vice president. Did the contenders themselves expect such a turn of events? What is at the basis of this? Our conversation started with these questions.

[Tuleyev] The Kuzbass is Russia in miniature, perhaps with the sole difference that we are about six months ahead regarding the acuteness of unfolding events. The Kuzbass is an area of environmental disaster, and these are the political passions that are seething throughout Russia. Suffice it to say that we now have 35 parties and movements operating which basically shape the political climate in the Kuzbass. Every party and every movement has its own platform, its views, and its ideas for the way Russia should overcome the crisis. Although the

actual fact of our getting involved in the election campaign looks slightly unusual, to put it bluntly, this is a totally natural phenomenon.

[Bocharov] In the past two years many good programs for overcoming the crisis have been elaborated in the country and in Russia. In them there are no more shortages. Executors is the only thing we're short of, that's all. I believe that the Kuzbass nominated Tuleyev because they saw in him a man who is able to carry out what has been worked out today.

[Gamov] Nevertheless I would like to return to the strikes that occurred in the Kuzbass, although a great deal has already been said about this. And yet: What is the prime reason for such a powerful social explosion? What position did you occupy in the past and do you occupy now with respect to the strike movement?

[A. Tuleyev] I believe that what happened in our country is a natural phenomenon. People have been driven into a corner for years.

Talking about the position we occupied during the last strikes and the position to which we adhere now, then it is diametrically opposed to Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's position. I am categorically opposed to such extreme measures. After all, the losses from these strikes that were held, which significantly hit metallurgy and the whole national economy, may perhaps be compared to the losses suffered by our economy in the years of the Great Patriotic War. Is it really possible to strangle the country with one's own hands!

[Bocharov] The miners are not angels but the Union Government is to blame for many things. It was the government that drove the Kuzbass miners to go on strike through its inability to act. It took decisions but did not carry them out, it made promises and then forgot about them. This acted as a spark.

[Tuleyev] And something else about our position. When things started "heating up" in the Kuzbass, I constantly appealed for an end to the strikes. And the Russian Government reacted more or less as follows: Strike if you want to. Such a reaction was quite explicable. After all, in this case, the strike aimed to support the interests of the Russian Government to a certain extent. Our oblast essentially became a mere pawn in the political game that was started. I spoke about this publicly in my speech at the previous Congress of RSFSR People's deputies. And today I can repeat that you cannot toy with people's lives by sacrificing them to a political struggle.

[Gamov] How would you comment on the transfer of the miners, particularly in your region, to Russian jurisdiction?

[Tuleyev] Personally, I assess this step positively. But I would not like it to just be received as the "redeployment" of the coal industry from one center to another. What is this about? Collectives should finally receive real autonomy. Enterprises should be granted the right to sell some of their output at free prices. If this does not happen, then the "new jurisdiction" is nothing other than a "new fiction," which obviously does not suit the miners.

[Bocharov] If some people think that the situation in the Kuzbass has stabilized now that the decision on the miners' transfer to Russian jurisdiction has been adopted, then they are quite mistaken. The fact that people have stopped striking does not mean that they have achieved what they were aiming for and that they are happy with everything. The situation will only be fully normalized if they feel positive progress both in the economy and in the social sphere. At the moment they do not trust anyone. To be honest, our miners are expressing these feelings not just with respect to the Union Government, but also the Russian Government. If the desired changes do not take place in the immediate future, then the Kuzbass, regardless of which center it will be subordinate to, may erupt again. Proceeding on the basis of these details, we are forming our own program which we will present at the presidential elections.

[Gamov] What are its basic positions?

[Tuleyev] As far as the practical side of things is concerned, then first of all, we intend to reach a situation whereby part of the industrial output produced by enterprises in the oblast, the kray, and the autonomous formation, are under the authority of the local soviet. Now we are told: Do not poke your nose into enterprises' affairs. So we are not poking our nose into anything. But what is happening as a result? The enterprise that has a superprofit is wallowing in luxury. At the same time invalids, pensioners, and students who are not protected on a social level, are eking out a poverty-stricken existence. This is not fair. If the Kemerovo Soviet received only 10 percent of the income from the output sold by the oblast, we would have put life in the Kuzbass to rights a long time ago and the situation here would not be as acute as it remains to this day.

I would like to devote particular attention to questions connected with the free development of nations and peoples who inhabit Russia. I believe that we need to unify the form of the autonomous formation, that is, make it uniform. Why divide Russia into autonomous okrugs, oblasts, and republics? Why start classifying peoples, thus sowing national strife? We must make legal provision for a transition from one type of a state system to another, for example, from an autonomous formation to a Union republic.

The main task of the future Russian president is to ensure such conditions so that to live honestly would mean to live honorably and not in poverty. A person making an honest living here now cannot afford one-tenth of what a shadow economy businessman has. This is not the Soviet way of doing things. Perestroyka has hit our ideas about socialist values. Things are reaching the

point where people ask the veterans of the Great Patriotic War things like: Did you spill your blood in vain in the fight against fascism. And what can young people believe in? They have nothing to believe in.... We must instill hope for the future in our people—both young and old. And that is the main sense of my election program.

[Bocharov] We must interlink the system of soviet power and presidential rule. Why is the USSR president faltering in implementing his decrees? Well, it is becuase he has no power structures in the localities. An analogous situation may occur in Russia, too. The RSFSR president should have permanent representatives in krays, oblasts, and republics. It would be best if these were chairmen of the relevant soviets.

[Gamov] Do you seriously hope for victory in the fight for the highest posts in the republic?

[Bocharov] We did not invent the fight, history itself did. Once there are contested elections, a fight is inevitable. What are we counting on? First of all, on our knowledge and experience. Each of us has been involved in active economic work all our adult life. And the main thing is that we can see real ways out of the crisis for Russia. Therefore, weighing everything up, we decided to participate in the presidential elections and we are hoping for success.

[Tuleyev] To be open about this, the imminent elections for the president of Russia smack mainly of deceiving the people. You could not elect a chairman of a rural soviet in a village in the ridiculously short timeframe we have been given.

Nevertheless, realizing all this, I have agreed to become involved in the fight for the president's post. Even if I lose, I will still have managed to take my program, designed to lead Russia out of the economic and political impasse, to the electorate. I hope that the man who becomes president will arm himself with it in his work. He will be obliged to do so even if just one voter votes for it. You might lose personally, but in the final analysis, this cause must win.

Bakatin Views Presidential Candidates

LD2805173191 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 27 May 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] A series of television interviews with Russian presidential candidates begins today. The first interview is with Vadim Bakatin. He is a lieutenant general and a member of the Security Council. He describes himself as an independent candidate who draws his support from those who work and study. Incidentally, you have the opportunity to ask Vadim Bakatin your questions. And the "Vesti" program has also decided to ask its own.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent A. Pishchayev] Hello, Vadim Viktorovich. Among the candidates for the office of president are three generals and one colonel. Is that not rather a lot for the period of disarmament and conversion?

[Bakatin] But I am interested in that, too.

[Pishchayev] Well, what do you think?

[Bakatin] Well, I do not know whether three generals are a lot or a few. Let us see what kind of generals they are, if they are like me, then that is probably rather a few.

[Pishchayev] Obviously you know the candidates for the office of Russian president well, which of them would you take on reconnaissance with you?

[Bakatin] Well, I respect, at least, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. I think that one may—and must—have respect for Ryzhkov, whom I know well. But I would not take one of the generals to whom you refer—Makashov—on reconnaissance, because I sense from his speeches that this is a general on whom it is very difficult to rely, and you can expect a lot of surprises from him. I do not know Zhirinovskiy, and so I would not like to, so to speak, stick my neck out here. But, as far as Tuleyev is concerned, I would take him with me on reconnaissance because I know Aman Gumirovich well, he is a nice fellow, he would not let you down. But I am afraid he will not be president of Russia because we do not know much about him. He might be a good president of the Kuzbass, and that is probably what he will be.

This is the first time I have met a journalist who has caught me on the street. I am very pleased with the changes that are at last happening among our television journalists. This is very pleasing, and I am glad that this new Russian Television which has just been founded, and which I wish great success, has adopted such a style of operation. Thank you, goodbye and all the best!

[Pishchayev] Thank you. Goodbye! [end recording]

Silayev Discusses Presidential Election

LD2805151291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1302 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] [Announcer] On Monday Ivan Silayev, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers chairman, visited Leningrad. He talked to our correspondent Oleg Klimov about the results of his visit, and also about the forthcoming election of the RSFSR president.

[Klimov] Ivan Stepanovich, this is your first visit to Leningrad as head of the Russian Government. What were your impressions, and how do you evaluate the results of the visit?

[Silayev] The visit was somewhat unexpected, although I have meant to come here many times. I had to come here in connection with the crash of the Tu-154, but I am glad that I was able to visit the (Trofinskiy) combine. Very interesting processes are going on there, the adoption of

new technologies, new equipment, and conversion of local plants is providing results here. At the same time we saw pictures of a certain confrontation between the supporters of new processes which are arriving in the countryside and of the implementation of land reform, and there are also opponents. Everything is as it should be here in our complex society. I gained a serious impression from the Lenvest joint enterprises. It produces three million pairs of shoes in a very small, I would say modest, production area. But new technology and a high degree of organization of labor, discipline, high pay, this is in fact what we are sometimes lacking today.

Finally, the meeting with the public of the city. I think I gained a lot from it, and I think the Leningraders did, too. I managed to convey to them our approaches in the work of the government, the thrust, and this thrust means energetic movement toward radical reform. We are not retreating, we are moving persistently, and making use of this meeting. I reminded the Leningraders that when they come to the ballot boxes they should once again weigh everything, what program they support, how they see Russia's future, as a renewed Russia in new economic conditions of market relations, or a return to old ways. I tried not to agitate, but didn't want them to forget when they come to the ballot boxes, and decide according to how our state of being Russian and the road that Russia needs to take prompts them. So, I am satisfied with the visit.

[Klimov] You have touched on a very important issue, the presidency of the republic. This is of interest to very many of our listeners. Would you say, in your view, what the introduction of the post of RSFSR president will provide for Russians?

[Silayev] In the Union as a whole and in Russia in particular, there is today a clear lack of executive discipline, and implementing laws that have been passed. This is particularly important for the Russian Federation, with its numerous levels of Soviets of all kinds, from republican to village ones, and in this complex state with its immense population, this is a big state, 150 million Russians. We cannot do without a clearly set up mechanism of executive power. We connect our hopes and intentions to implement the principles of economic reforms that are defined in our economic program directly with this act, with the election of a president. If we are instructed to form a new government, we will undoubtedly be in a position to implement these radical approaches more effectively with a new form, a presidential structure of administration. That is very important.

[Klimov] The presidential campaign has already begun. How do you evaluate the candidates for president and their programs?

[Silayev] First of all, so far, of all the candidates, Boris NIkolayevich Yeltsin has a specific and clear program. He is a direct co-author of the program, it begins with his name. So we have no grounds to speak about the programs of other contenders. There are individual fragments, but Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov said a few days ago that he would have a program, but right at the start he said that this program would be based on the proposals which he has put forward in the past, and in general we know how that ended up. I would like to tell you that it is only radical reform, only energetic movement, transition to market relations, that can not only put the damper on negative processes, but also provide for the beginning to the end of further decline and then, of course, an active upturn. So I will myself be voting for Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, and I have no doubt that Yeltsin will win.

[Klimov] A final question, one which I think is of concern to many Russians, the majority of Russians, I think. If everything develops in our economy as you plan, when will the living standards of our people being to rise?

[Silayev] It is envisaged that signs of overproduction may emerge in 1995-96. To some extent, small signs will appear in a couple of years, but such certain ones, when it will be necessary to prevent this looming threat, because it is also an unpleasant effect, at the moment we have major underproduction, but overproduction will also come. It is characteristic of a market economy, but that will be a problem of another order. From the point of view of when the people will sense an improvement, a real improvement, on the one hand in their incomes, and on the other hand in being able to buy what their family and what the individual needs, we expect that this will take not just 1991, but also 1992; around the end of 1992 or beginning of 1993.

[Klimov] Thank you.

Interviewed on Economic Program

LD2905013991 Moscow Cental Television First Program Network in Russian 2122 GMT 28 May 91

[Interview with Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, prime minister of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, by reporter Boris Kostenko at the central television studios; date not given--recorded]

[Text] [Kostenko] Ivan Stepanovich, we have prepared a few questions in advance. The country and the republic are in a crisis. Several structures, including the state ones, have at once begun, separately, to develop an anticrisis program. There are two that have been officially registered. The USSR Supreme Soviet has adopted Pavlov's program. The Russian Supreme Soviet is offering a program that is now being called the Yeltsin-Silayev program. In other words, this is your program. There is also the Yavlinskiy program, or the problems that are being studied by Yavlinskiy's group. He is working on this jointly with Harvard University Scientists, for the G-7 countries, so that they can decide on offering financial help to the Soviet Union. What is your attitude on this strange situation?

[Silayev] Thank you. First of all, I want to specify that our program is not an anticrisis one, but a program for stabilization of the economy and transition to market relations. It naturally includes anticrisis measures. The program of the Cabinet of Ministers, or Pavlov's program had a concrete and precise—I would call it localized—task for getting out of the crisis. I said had not by accident, because it was approved in principle by the USSR Supreme Soviet, but the instructions were for it to be elaborated, with consideration given to the opinions and suggestions of the Union republics. Today it has been transformed into a plan for joint action by the Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of the republics. This is the fundamental difference.

At the same time, our Russian program is the continuation of that program from the autumn of last year, the so-called 500 days program, with a certain, perhaps more realistic, degree for its implementation. That is why in our program the anticrisis measures are just a stage in the general work for the transition to the new market relations. Thus, the Russian leadership and the Russian Goverment, from the very beginning, have taken the course to the transition toward market relations. We intend to implement these changes in our program. In regard to what you are saying about Yavlinskiy and what he is working on....

[Kostenko, interrupting] He is your adviser.

[Silayev] Yes. I just was going to remind you that he is my adviser on the economic reforms. We meet with him often and, in a rather active way, discuss things. This interesting undertaking in which Yavlinskiy plays a very serious role, this intention to include G-7 in solving our problems, this was also discussed with us at Yavlinskiy's initiative. This is not an alternative or an additional program: this will be an international program, as you see. I know that Yavlinskiy is actively working on it now. Now he is again in the United States. We are awaiting his return with great interest. Questions have already been asked. You might have a question about what will become of the Russian program? We know how a program named the Marshall Plan was carried out after the war. Unfortunately, at that time we, as the saying goes, went our own way, followed our own path. Now we see where this path took us. Nevertheless, our Russian program, in our opinion, will fit in with the international one, should it be developed, with its market orientation, with its principles and approaches to the task of freeing man from various types of administrative oppression. This program, we believe, will fit in with the one that might be realized as a joint program of the seven and the Soviet Union.

[Kostenko] At this time, as some republics declare their intention to seceed from the Soviet Union and as separatism is on the rise, as nationalism is increasing, sometimes in such unseemly and ghastly forms, the Russian—or Russian-speaking, as they are correctly called—refugees have appeared. Some of them have been registered and some have not, but all of them are coming to Russia. How does the Russian parliament, and Russian Government in particular, prepare itself, and is it ready now for such new and rather sad realities?

[Silayev] Yes. You are absolutely right. This is a worrying situation. Moreover, today it does not show any tendency for stabilization. The processes, unfortunately, continue. We are already feeling this. However, I should point out the following fact: At the moment, nearly half a million citizens have arrived on the territory of the Russian Federation as refugees. These are the Russians, and the Russian-speaking, but not just them. There are many others, including the native peoples of some republics who have fled and have asked us to protect them from certain extremist ambitions. There are 500,000 people. This is very serious. At the same time, I should like to point out to you that the Russian citizen, the Russian character, has a certain quality that has already demonstrated itself here. According to our data—and we are sure about this—not a single citizen of another republic, another nationality, has fled Russian territory as a refugee. Apart from this, we still think that transition toward market relations and radical economic transformations are some of the most important arguments, which will eventualy lead the termination of the internecine quarrels and interethnic disputes. Economics is a powerful weapon, so you see, my weapon is peaceful. It can either complicate or improve and stabilize things.

[Kostenko] Well, let us hope.

[Silayev] Yes, of course. Not only hope, but show some action.

[Kostenko] Thank you.

Khasbulatov: We Can Work With Gorbachev

PM2905070091 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 24 May 91 p 16

[Interview with Ruslan Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, by Enrico Franceschini in Moscow; date not given]

[Excerpt] Moscow—"Boris Yeltsin has never considered taking Gorbachev's place," said Ruslan Khasbulatov, who has for the past 18 months been deputy to the radical Russian leader. As vice president of the the largest, wealthiest, and most important of the 15 Soviet republics, this 49-year-old economics professor has often represented the voice of reason and moderation with respect to his impetuous boss, though he shares his political stances. Like many of Yeltsin's close aides, he has maintained his independence of thought: Unlike the Russian president, Khasbulatov considers Gorbachev "a great leader of our time" and is still a Communist Party member.

Now, for strategic reasons, Yeltsin has chosen someone else—Colonel Vladimir Rutskoy—as his own candidate

for the vice presidency in the 12 June Russian elections. Khasbulatov refuses to comment on this, but in his interview with LA REPUBBLICA, conducted in his office in the Russian Parliament, as he considered past and future relations between the radical opposition and the Kremlin, he pledged to continue working for dialogue and concord between the two sides.

[Franceschini] Mr. Deputy Chairman, perhaps you are the most suitable person to explain once and for all what lies behind the rivalry between Gorbachev and Yeltsin....

[Khasbulatov] The rivalry is not between two individuals but between two different philosophies, two different approaches to the reforms, to the problems of democracy.

The party press tries to make people believe that Yeltsin's aim is to overthrow Gorbachev. This is not so. The differences have always been political. From the outset Yeltsin has supported the market economy and full autonomy from the center for the republics. Now we can see a considerable rapprochement between the two, and I would like to contribute to this process. There is room for both of them: Let the Soviet president lead our great country. Yeltsin, as president of Russia, occupies a position commanding equal respect, and aspires to nothing else.

[Franceschini] But why do you say now that you accept Gorbachev, after having requested his resignation?

[Khasbulatov] Partly out of the anxiety that it would be worse to have someone else in his place. But in recent months our relations with the Kremlin deteriorated greatly. The president discredited our agricultural reform proposal, which could have resolved the food problem, with his help. Then in January there was the crisis in Lithuania. The Kremlin-controlled press launched a campaign of lies against Yeltsin. That being so, it was reasonable for Yeltsin to speak out as he did on television (requesting the president's resignation—LA REPUBBLICA editor's note). Any further development of the reforms seemed impossible if Gorbachev remained in power. Of course, it was a risky thing to do, but it did make many people ponder the democratic processes. And since the president seemed to be a prisoner of the reactionaries, the essence of Yeltsin's argument was that by requesting Gorbachev's resignation he was proposing an alternative to the country. We immediately felt the support of the grassroots, of the miners' strike, which we did not call for. Gorbachev found that he had to choose between resigning or taking the path of transformations, and the 10-way agreement (signed between the nine largest Soviet republics and Gorbachev—LA REPUBBLICA editor's note) on the division of powers and a solution to the crisis was basically a reasonable compromise between the 'center' and the 'left' on the eve of the CPSU Central Committee plenum at which the right was planning to attack Gorbachev.

[Franceschini] But do you consider Gorbachev the final heir of stagnation, as Yeltsin described him on television, or a reformer with whom to struggle for democracy?

[Khasbulatov] I believe, and I want to believe, that Gorbachev has chosen to forge ahead toward greater and greater reforms. He himself saw that half-measures ultimately destabilize the situation, and I believe that he is now able to move on from the policy of maneuvers to that of concrete measures. I believe that Gorbachev could be a reliable partner, as long as no pressure is imposed on the republics from above. I fully agree with the idea of a coalition government, at the national level. So as far as I am concerned, Gorbachev is not the last of the reactionaries: I believe that it is possible to work with him; I consider him a great politician of our time. He could have continued as CPSU general secretary, but instead he boldly set to combating the totalitarian system: He has not yet succeeded, but we must give him due credit. Nevertheless, just as his merits are great, his errors have also been great.

[Franceschini] You say yourself that in past months Gorbachev has been a prisoner of the reactionaries. Was it not dangerous to expect him to make immediate progress toward the left? Was that not asking too much of him?

[Khasbulatov] I do not want to overestimate the power of the conservatives, of the armed forces, the KGB, and the military-industrial complex. What can they do against the striking miners, for instance? If we continue moving toward a market economy, those forces will concern themselves with what the Constitution requires of them, and they will no longer be used for the purposes of repression in the Baltic and in other such cases.

[Franceschini] Earlier you mentioned a coalition government at the national level. Is this really feasible?

[Khasbulatov] Yes, it can be done, and in fact it is necessary. I perceive it as feasible in two stages—first through consultations, or a roundtable, as it has been called, between the Kremlin and the republican leaders; then through consultations with all the country's political forces. The final objective must be a mixed government, a coalition of forces, but above all a government composed of professionals, a government of experts that can introduce rapid changes. [passage omitted]

Interviewed by NOVOYE VREMYA

PM2805145391 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No. 20, 14 May 91 pp 7-8

[Interview with Ruslan Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, by correspondent Irina Lagunina; no place or date of interview given: "Ruslan Khasbulatov: 'I Am Somewhat Skeptical About the Idea of "Strong Power" '"]

[Text] [NOVOYE VREMYA] The Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist

Republic] People's Deputies ended by giving emergency powers to the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. How did Boris Yeltsin utilize them?

[Khasbulatov] We are not talking about any "emergency" powers similar to those given to the president of the Union by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies some time ago. Incidentally, the Congress of USSR People's Deputies itself was not vested with the powers it gave to the president. It partially usurped the rights of Union republics, probably assuming that a series of problems could thus have been resolved. Time has shown that nothing of the sort happened. In our case we had a slight redistribution of functions in favor of the republic's Supreme Soviet. The "controlling stake" is, of course, still in the hands of the Congress of Russian People's Deputies. The congress reassigned certain powers to the Supreme Soviet, its presidium, and its chairman, and we have fully utilized them.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] In what sphere did you utilize the new powers?

[Khasbulatov] We adopted an entire package of presidential laws and a series of normative acts for the holding of presidential elections in Russia, as well as in the economic sphere. Boris Yeltsin himself utilized the additional opportunities given to him. Just one—and very graphic—example. Only the chairman of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet was able to halt the miners' strikes which shook the entire country. The situation was critical: The strikes could have gradually affected the entire industry. Do you recall that, at the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, some speakers asked Boris Yeltsin to approach the strikers because he was the only one to whom they would listen? I thought to myself at the time: Is he likely to take this one on? After all, he would have to "pay up" a little later. How? Exercising extended powers, the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet succeeded in creating new socioeconomic prerequisites for improving the miners' living conditions. He utilized the government apparatus and involved Union structures in solving the question—and a special agreement was concluded between the first deputy prime ministers of the USSR and the RSFSR on transferring the sector under Russia's jurisdiction.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] What does this mean in practice?

[Khasbulatov] Many people imagine that this means replacing one center by another—a Russian one, and replacing one set of functionaries by another. In actual fact, in the meantime we have elaborated and have started creating completely different types of enterprises, something akin to joint stock associations geared to the market, to ensure that a sizeable proportion of revenues and profits is utilized for social needs and for urban and rural developments or is left for the workers themselves. We are not setting up some sort of bureaucratic structure. We are simply helping to shape new market relations, in which the workers and management personnel themselves would be interested. All this required a major effort but, in exchange, we did not **put down** the strike but persuaded people that striking would be **disadvantageous** at present.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] What about the strikers' political demands?

[Khasbulatov] In my view, we have succeeded in convincing them that the slogan about replacing the country's president is inappropriate at the moment. Regarding the demands for creating a coalition government and the "roundtable" ideas, I consider them sensible and justified. We must tackle the solution of these questions and, together with our partner Union republics, hold talks with the president, the central administration, and the USSR Supreme Soviet to create a government that would enjoy the people's confidence.

Generally speaking, I am firmly convinced that the economy must now be freed as soon as possible from the tyranny of the state and especially of politicians. It must work according to its own market laws. Our job is to create normative acts which will not hamper the market mechanism but will stimulate its development.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] A new program for Russia's market development has been published. Would a market be capable of existing in one isolated republic? Neighboring Belorussia, for example, has no intention of changing its approach toward economic development.

[Khasbulatov] I perceive no problems here. How did the USSR build its relations with market economy countries in the past? I am not idealizing our Russian Government, but it is nonetheless moving forward. I am also skeptical about those who are being cautious now. Why be cautious? For six years now we have been marking time. Consideration, thrift, and thorough forecasting of various consequences are a different matter. It is, of course, necessary.

The new economic development program incorporates the basic provisions of the 500 days program. Unfrotunately, we will have to rely on just our own efforts. Incidentally, last fall I proposed creating a parallel program for Russia, based on our ideas of future economic development included in the Shatalin-Petrakov-Yavlinskiy program, and starting work on it. Even then I did not believe that the central administration and the Ryzhkov government would accept the 500 days program even though the president swore blindly that he would demand its adoption.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] If the economy will continue developing according to market laws and is freed from the state, why does Boris Yeltsin need strong power?

[Khasbulatov] I am somewhat skeptical about the ideas of "strong" or "weak" power. Power must be effective, producing specific results. Look at the president of the USSR. Think of the powers vested in him! And what is happening? Power must be effective, and in order to achieve this it must be properly exercised both vertically

and horizontally. A few days ago the television showed an interesting report from San Diego. A city with a population of 1 million is run by a city council comprising just eight members. And they are perfectly well coping with their duties. Is this strong or weak power? Yet our Moscow City Soviet alone has more deputies than the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has members. Rayon, rural, settlement, and city soviets have hundreds of members. This power was previously propped up by party committees. This system must be completely reorganized. It is not enough to introduce the post of president. The pyramid's base remains the same. There is a multitude of Russian cities today raising the question of reducing the number of deputies and sessions and introducing the institution of mayor. Why should we resist?

[NOVOYE VREMYA] But this would probably require changes in the administrative-territorial division.

[Khasbulatov] We must gradually get accustomed to the idea that the rayon division will have to be changed. Our rayon division was created only to meet the needs of the CPSU's structure. Some sort of party committee state.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] Are you not afraid that people might say: The new Russian leadership is using authoritarian methods?

[Khasbulatov] Everybody is talking about some sort of dictatorship emerging. In my view, these reflections, including some in your own journal, have played a negative role. They have gone to substantiate an artificial strong-hand theory and the inevitable emergence of dictatorship. These ideas were actually utilized by the right wing. In my view, the attempts at a counterrevolutionary coup which we observed were largely brought to life by sundry pseudoscientific forecasts within the framework of the strong-hand concept and innacurate appraisals of "the masses' shift to the right."

[NOVOYE VREMYA] It seems to me that you are overestimating the importance of the press. Nobody tried to scientifically substantiate the need for the army to intervene in, for example, interethnic conflicts. Nonetheless, it was ordered to intervene. What is your attitude toward such a role being played by the Army?

[Khasbulatov] Negative. It would be better for the army not to be used where it should not be used and, moreover, for purposes which are alien to its nature. Its constitutional duty is to defend the fatherland against an external adversary. Internal Troops should be used in interethnic conflicts if there is no other possible alternative. During Boris Yeltsin's meeting with Zviad Gamsakhurdia we proposed that the Armed Forces being used in South Ossetia be replaced by Internal Troops. Unfortunately, we are not to blame for this agreement's nonimplementation.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] What do you feel about Russian citizens participating in combat operations against the civilian population?

[Khasbulatov] We proceed from the premise that the Russian Federation has no army. We agreed that we will not create one. But back last year the RSFSR Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution prohibiting the use of Russian citizens in combat operations associated with interethnic conflicts.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] An RSFSR Supreme Soviet delegation traveled to Nagorno-Karabakh. For what purpose?

[Khasbulatov] This is not the first time our deputies' group traveled to that region. I think that the deputies' desire to see for themselves the situation there is perfectly natural, especially now that, according to reports by the press and the two republics' leaderships, battles are being fought there.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] Earlier the center stood aside from this conflict, now it is directly involved in combat operations. What is Russia's stance?

[Khasbulatov] We are talking about two autonomous [samostoyatelnyye] republics and, of course, we show equal respect in our relations with them. We called on the leaderships of Armenia and Azerbaijan to put an end to the armed confrontation. This conflict can be resolved only through talks.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] Can Russia suggest a way out of this deadlock?

[Khasbulatov] Obviously, there must be a program for the stage-by-stage easing of tension. For example, combat operations cease completely at the first stage. The next stage involves the withdrawal of guerrillas from specific rayons, named by both sides. During the third stage, the sides pledge not to permit fresh clashes and not to use military formations and groups of armed people for the solution of disputed questions. Unfortunately, I cannot perceive any such program by the central administration, which should actually suggest it. Finally, it seems to me that a really great moral and psychological effect could be produced by a trip by the USSR president to the region, his meetings with the republics' leaders, and a tour of Nagorno-Karabakh. I do not know why the president is taking his time.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] As far as I can see, the Russian leadership is worried in case the conflicts in the Transcaucasus have a direct effect on Russia.

[Khasbulatov] The armed struggle syndrome could spread also to Northern Caucasus. An explosive situation prevails also there. We adopted a law on the rehabilitation of deported peoples, a law which, for the first time, really proclaimed full respect for these peoples and restored their rights. The law will be implemented in stages, not by means of capturing disputed territories and lands. The settlement of the most complex problems we have inherited demands patience. We hope that all ethnic communities will show understanding and respect for the law.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] In other words, Russia could at a given moment get directly involved in the process of reconciliation in the Transcaucasus?

[Khasbulatov] Russia must participate in the solution of conflicts—history itself has assigned to it a rather important role, the role of stabilizing factor capable of uniting our republics. Consequently, Russia itself must act as a united country.

All participants in the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, B.N. Yeltsin, A.I. Lukyanov, and leaders of Russian republics expressed with utmost clarity the basic idea: A united Union cannot exist without Russian unity. It was fully agreed that Russia's republics are components of a single Russian Federative State. At the same time, we must guarantee them a greater status as members of this united state. The only one to disagree with this approach was the chairman of Tatarstan's Supreme Soviet, who was not quite clear in presenting his concept of Tatarstan's status. He advocated that his republic sign the Union treaty "separately." Frankly speaking, I failed to understand the meaning of "seperately." After all, our other republics will also sign "separately" but through their delegations which will be part of the RSFSR statewide delegation.

I thus appraise this meeting as very positive, especially since the country's president and the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet very consistently (and for the first time!) indicated their desire to safeguard the RSFSR's unity and integrity.

Vitaliy Doguzhiyev Chairs Tatar Commission Session

LD2805103991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1928 GMT 27 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 27 May (TASS)—At a regular session of the commission chaired by USSR First Deputy Prime Minister Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, the progress of the implementation of the USSR Government resolution on the immediate measures for solving problems connected with the Crimean Tatars returning to the Crimea was discussed.

It was noted that about 135,000 Crimean Tatars are living in the Crimean ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] at present—more than one-third of those living in the USSR. A considerable number of them have returned recently.

An approximate layout of settlements has been adopted, land allocations for private housing have been given, and measures for using state capital investments have been elaborated, including the development of a base for the construction industry, and development of existing and creation of new construction organizations. Questions connected with the revival of the culture of the Crimean Tatars are being resolved.

The unorganized arrival of the Crimean Tatar population is making the implementation of immediate measures extremely complicated, and because of this problems of supplying the population with foodstuffs and industrial goods, providing housing and public health and school establishments remain extremely acute.

As is shown by studies of their families, conducted by the USSR State Committee for Statistics in areas where there are substantial concentrations of Crimean Tatars, an absolute majority of them wish to return for permanent residence to the Crimea in the next three years. This will demand of state bodies, social representatives of the Crimean Tatar people, and a specially created committee on affairs of deported peoples of the Council of Ministers of the Tatar ASSR, coordinated work directed at a systematic return of those who wish to return.

After clarifying a number of positions it was deemed necessary to adopt a special resolution by the USSR Government, envisaging, along with resolving social matters, organizing special commissions in areas with substantial concentrations of the Crimean Tatar population to give help to families who are returning to the Crimea in an organized way in resolving legal, economic, transport, and other problems.

Tatarstan Not To Participate in Election

LD2805102491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0820 GMT 28 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Sorokin]

[Text] Kazan, 28 May (TASS)—The sovereign republic of Tatarstan will not officially take part in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] presidential elections. A session of the Tatar Supreme Soviet made this decision today.

However, in accordance with human rights it has been decided to offer assistance to those who wish to take part in the election of the Russian president, which, in the opinion of deputies, does not affect the basic provisions of Tatarstan's sovereignty. Participation or nonparticipation by citizens of the republic in the voting is on a purely voluntary basis.

The session also examined the question of electing a president of Tatarstan. Of the five candidates only one gathered the number of signatures necessary—at least 50,000. This was Mintimer Shaymiyev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Tatarstan. His name will go forward onto the voting paper for a secret ballot in elections to be held on 12 June.

Western Republics

Belorussia Adopts Law on Entrepreneurship

LD2905063991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1842 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Minsk, 28 May (TASS)—Having unanimously voted against the government's privatization program,

the discussion of which took two and one-half days, the Belorussian parliamentarians in the same unanimous manner spoke in favor of adopting a Law "On Entrepreneurship in The Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]." It was approved in its first reading by the previous session. Further work on it was done in commissions. Today it was approved in less than an hour. The law takes effect from 1 July this year and is aimed at creating conditions for broad economic initiative and entrepreneurship of citizens on the basis of equality of all forms of ownership.

According to the document, entrepreneurship in the republic is an independent and enterprising activity of citizens which is aimed at obtaining profits or private income. Individuals and whole collectives, foreign citizens and persons without any citizenship can be entrepreneurs within the rights and duties provided for by the legislation of the Belorussian SSR currently in force.

An entrepreneur has a right to undertake any economic activity that is not prohibited by law, and to set up any form of enterprise. He can make use of finances, property of other citizens, enterprises and organizations, including foreign ones, the document says. The law makes a proviso for duties and responsibilities of an entrepreneur, provides guarantees for entrepreneurship, and explains conditions for the cessation of entrepreneurial activities.

Scientific, technical, and legal support of entrepreneurial activities and insurance against business risk are among the guarantees. In order to raise the effectiveness and to spread good experience, the state is setting up information, consultative, and other centers, as well as innovative and insurance funds.

The republic's Council of Ministers is instructed to prepare proposals on bringing the current legislation in accordance with the new law by 1 September.

Belorussian Parliament Defers Anticrisis Program

PM2805150391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Mikhail Shimanskiy: "Anticrisis Program Deferred"]

[Text] Minsk—The Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] state program to stabilize the economy and provide the population with social protection "failed to get through" at a session of the republic's parliament. Deputies gave the government two days to finalize it.

It is hard to tell what will be the fate of the anticrisis program on which the entire republic is pinning particular hopes. It has already been discussed amid an atmosphere of extreme tension. Some deputies voiced a positive opinion of the program while some—mainly opposition parliamentarians—reckon that it is antimarket and will result in economic dictatorship. Some deputies point to the program's superficiality and the government's inconsistency in implementing the economic reforms that would rapidly produce market relations.

USSR People's Deputy A. Malofeyev, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, speaking at the session, said that the program requires serious consideration. The document should clearly answer the question of what the republic and every individual will gain from the transition to a market economy, particularly from destatization and privatization.

Everything is calm in Minsk, enterprises are working normally. In this connection I cannot understand the desire on the part of some members of the city strike committee during a conversation with journalists to do all they can to complicate the situation or simply engage in wishful thinking. Thus, V. Rossosnykh, secretary of the Minsk strike committee, said in an article entitled "37 Questions at the Session" (IZVESTIYA No. 121) that one-fourth of the workers at the "Integral" Association stayed at their posts, while the others went off to a rally. P. Goydenko, general director of "Integral," said that the association's entire collective was working normally at this time.

Belorussian Official Stresses Foreign Cooperation

LD2405182691 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belorussian 1700 GMT 27 May 91

[Text] Comrade Vyacheslav Kebich has informed people's deputies at the Belorussian Supreme Soviet session on the government's activities in widening international and inter-republic cooperation in the field of setting up joint ventures and increasing production of consumer goods and food.

[Begin Kebich recording] Evaluating today the state of the economy including finances, I should honestly say that we will not get out of the situation in which we have now found ourselves just by relying on our own efforts, tete-a-tete meetings, and internal resources. We must go for broad and direct contacts with foreign financial and banking institutions. We should open the road for foreign investments.

Independent external economic relations are a new business for us. But it is growing. Programs for developing priority directions in the economy and attracting foreign capital have been worked out. A search for business partners is actively under way now. A whole number of entrepreneurs from the United States, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, Japan, Taiwan, and South Korea have expressed their intention to start cooperation with us. Inter-government agreements on trade cooperation with Czechoslovakia and the DPRK have been signed. The work on such agreements with Hungary, Slovenia, and Serbia is now in the final stage.

We are firm and persistent in trying to ensure that the republic has its own share of those credits which are

granted to the USSR. And it should be said that the center, albeit reluctantly, still has to face these demands. The republic has been allocated over 60 million hard currency rubles from Spain's credits. They will go mainly on purchasing equipment for the processing industry. The Italian credit of almost 15 million hard currency rubles will be spent on purchasing equipment for production of children's food. Now, by the way, the work on programs for broad economic cooperation between Belorussia and Italy is amost complete. This will be carried out on the basis of [word indistinct] long-term credits granted to us by the Italians. A special working body, the association called "Italy-Belorussian Trade Chamber" has been set up for this.

In less than a year our Committee for External Economic Relations has managed to attract 53 foreign firms for cooperation in joint ventures, with a capital fund of over 40 million hard currency rubles.

The government is going to use such an unorthodox—for us—method of strengthening the economty as foreign loans. But straight away I want to stress that our intentions to receive such loans—and this is confirmed by meetings with business circles—can only be successful if we manage to preserve in the republic a certain [word indistinct] and to prove Belorussia as a reliable business partner. [words indistinct] and we expect $1 billion, will allow us to carry out technical re-equipment of the agro-industrial complex and the branches which produce consumer goods; to give impetus to accelerating production of pharmaceuticals preparations and medical equipment; to equip with modern technology the production base of the construction industry; and also to create a powerful export potential. This means that we will be paying back only with the products on which these dollars have been used.

All this is objectively necessary. This is, after all, what all the countries which were launching a profound modernization of their economies started with. Moreover, we are interested in this not only from a purely financial and economic point of view. Behind foreign investments there are as a rule new technologies, foreign management experience, and production organization.

Unfortunately, we have quite a number of barriers on this road. First of all, the republics have no legal basis, no certain state guarantees for protecting foreign investments. There is as yet no such a legislation at all. And we have to work it out as soon as possible without looking toward the center. We have to create for foreign investors the most favorable conditions for hard currency capital to be streaming into Belorussia. This is what concerns foreign business contacts. [end recording]

Belorussian Budget Problems, Principles Outlined

LD2805181191 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belorussian 1730 GMT 22 May 91

[Excerpts] At the routine session of parliament, Mikhail Myasnikovich, first deputy chairman of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers, spoke of urgent measures to implement the repubican state budget in the second half of this year. He said:

[Begin Myasnikovich recording] The integral part, I would say the core, of the suggested program is the measures to stabilize the financial situation in the republic. You remember very well that the republican budget for 1991 was adopted with a deficit of 3.5 billion rubles [R]. At the same time the government was instructed to carry out throughout the year a number of additional measures to reduce it. [passage omitted] However, despite the desperate circumstances surrounding the budget the social orientation of the budget not only remains but is reinforced. Thus, funds to education are going to be increased, compared with December's figures, by R1,000,500,000; social security by R535 million; law enforcement by R463 million; culture by R63 million; and science by R43 million.

Many deputies are interested in two other questions: relations with the Union budget and the situation in the local budgets. In short, relations with the Union budget will be implemented according to the signed agreements. This was confirmed in the statement by the leaders of nine Union republics. The enterprises of the Union and republican subordination will transfer 17 percent of its profits to the all-Union needs—R2.4 billion—and 30 percent of tax on sales—another R300 million—and nothing else. I declare this with full responsibility. As for what concerns the R1.35 billion which must be transferred to other regions in connection with the price rises, that sum will be defined. You know that it was previously considered to be R4.2 billion. What about the local budgets, without urgent measures the deficit there will go up to R2.8 billion which will amount to 25 percent, the deficit of the republic's budget reaching 32 percent.

Esteemed people's deputies! the implementation of the suggested measures will enable us to cut the deficit from R5 billion to R4 billion which is R500 million higher than was adopted by the supreme Soviet last December. The government does not see real ways to further reduce it over the year. No doubt, such a deficit will make the functioning of the economy more difficult. That is why we ask you to support our measures and, as a way out, the government's request that the Belorussian National Bank's accrediting of the sum of the budget deficit with it being further written off to the state debt. [end recording]

Ukraine's Kravchuk on Union Treaty Issues

LD2805174391 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 27 May 91

[Text] Leonid Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, has appeared on Ukrainian Television. Our correspondent, Oles Bedzyk, reports:

[Begin recording] [Bedzyk] Leonid Kravchuk talked about the session of the preparatory committee, which

was convened in accordance with the decision of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies to draft the union treaty and decide on the way of its conclusion. As is known, a broad and constructive exchange of views took place on the observations expressed by the republics concerning the draft treaty that has been published in the press. The participants also discussed in an all-round way the procedure for signing the treaty by representatives of sovereign states and the structure of all-Union organs.

The leader of the Ukrainian parliament particularly stressed in the television interview the need to separate the competences of the center and the republics. He underlined the priority role of the creation of the all-Union structures of sovereign republics [as heard]. Leonid Kravhcuk also dwelt in detail on such a painful question as the title of the union treaty and the name of the future union. He said among other things:

[Kravchuk] Almost all republics and all members of the preparatory committee favored this as a treaty on a union of sovereign states. And this description was approved as its name. Our position, I mean the position of the Supreme Soviet and the outcome of the referendum as well as our republican poll, when 26 million voters cast their votes for a union of sovereign states—this is the viewpoint which is being insistently carried out by us (?day by day). It has found the necessary support, and almost unanimously, or rather by an overwhelming majority, we agreed to call it a treaty on the union of sovereign states.

[Bedzyk] To some extent this contradicts the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies. In this connection Leonid Kravchuk said this:

[Kravchuk] If we are to fulfill the decisions of the Supreme Soviet, then we have to proceed from a completely different concept. What should Ukraine do? It is very difficult to answer this question. The answer sounded approximately like this: Life is life, dialectics is dialectics, deputies are deputies, but as to us, we have to proceed from the premises—what the republics are bringing to Moscow. Because the treaty and the union are being created by republics, not by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Bedzyk] One of the questions Leonid Kravchuk talked about at length in the television interview related to the problem of ideological orientation of the Union treaty. Ukraine's leader stressed that the drafting group and members of the preparatory committee arrived, by an overwhelming majority, at the conclusion that no ideologization can have a place in it. He stressed:

[Kravchuk] The treaty has to be a state document. No state legislative and normative documents can contain ideological orientaion. Ideological orientation is a matter for parties. And if now a party, say, the Communist party, introduces ideology into state documents, then what will happen if in the next elections the communists find themselves in a minority? It would mean that the new ruling party would review all state legislative and normative documents. At times one hears that something of the kind exists in other states. Even if it does, France is not called the French socialist or capitalist republic. The danger stems from the fact that we have gotten used to a one-party system and to a single ideology which (?supposedly was supported by the entire people). So no one perceived then that the ideologized state documents would have to be redrawn. There are two parties in the United States—the Democrats and the Republicans. Their ideologies do not differ much. Let us look at ourselves now. A great number of new parties have appeared here which not only do not accept the Communist ideology, but reject it. This is a fact. These parties are supported by a considerable part of the people. Thus, if we introduce into state documents the ideology of this or that party, then the state will defend only those people who subscribe to this ideology. And what about other parties and the rest of the people?

[Bedzyk] You have listened to fragments from Leonid Kravchuks' interview for Ukrainian television. [end recording]

Ukrainian Constitution Debate Causes Rifts

PM2705112791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[S. Tsikora report: "What Will the Ukrainian Constitution Be Like"]

[Text] Kiev—A new political reality is intensively taking shape in the Ukraine: A regrouping of forces within parties, movements, unions, and groupings is under way.

The first and clearest signal of this rang out from the hall of the republic Supreme Soviet. As soon as a truly important issue was submitted for deputies' consideration, it emerged that neither the Communists in "Group 239," nor the democrats in the "Narodna Rada" could any longer boast unity.

A clear picture of the changed reality emerged during the discussion of the outline of the new Ukrainian constitution. This document is rated as the second most important document after the Declaration of State Sovereignty, because it is linked with the implementation of the idea of acquisition of real statehood by the Ukraine. However, the parliamentarians' perception of the path to be followed to achieve this objective differed widely. The hottest debate flared up between the supporters of the draft presented by the Constitutional Commission headed by L. Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukranian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, and the defenders of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee's draft, which bears the signatures of the republic's party leaders beginning with S. Gurenko.

During the year of parliamentary work, deputies have probably never found themselves in a situation where they had to openly choose between two documents with very

similar sounding titles—"Constitution of the Ukraine" and "Constitution of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic,"—but documents which are very different in political terms. The divergence of opinions manifested itself on virtually all the fundamental provisions—whether the new constitution should incorporate the term "socialist choice" or not, whether the republic president should be elected by parliament or universal suffrage, whether the legal norms of the Union treaty should be enshrined in the Fundamental Law, or whether the treaty should not be mentioned at all.... Deep cracks have appeared on the monolith of "Group 239."

The ranks of the opposition "Narodna Rada" did not look much better. Here, too, deep divisions of opinion came to light. Some argued passionately in favor of the draft ouline drawn up by the Constitutional Commission expressing backing for L. Kravchuk. Others argued that it would be premature to introduce the presidency in the Ukraine....

Two days of voting on the controversial provisions of the outline have determined the thrust of the Constitutional Commission's future work. It is to develop ideas in accordance with which the future of the Ukraine will be linked with the introduction of presidential power, curbed by the Supreme Soviet's right of veto. The Ukrainian parliament is to become a single-chamber, professional body, judges will be elected for a period of 10 years. Ukraine's membership of the Union, or withdrawal from it, is to be reflected in the formula "the republic has the right to enter into unions."

The mention of the socialist orientation of our society in the text of the future Fundamental Law evoked radical disagreement from the opposition. Despite the fact that they could not muster the requisite number of votes to support their view in the hall of the Supreme Soviet, the majority could not get this thesis included in the constitution either having failed to gain two-thirds of the votes of the total number of deputies. The opposition proposed that both versions of the constitution—the version drawn up by the Communists, and the version elaborated by the democrats—be submitted for people's discussion and referendum. In short, quite a few battles concerning the constitution still lie ahead, and, clearly, it will take quite some time to formulate all these theses into precisely-worded paragraphs of the constitution.

The discussion of the draft outline of the constitution has shown that an intensive process of formation of new factions is under way in parliament, both among Communists and in the democrats' ranks. At the latest press conference given by deputies from the opposition parties it was announced that a movement on the lines of the Russian parliament's "Communists for democracy" is about to make its appearance in the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, with the consequences which will ensue from this for the alignment of political forces.

The situation outside the walls of the parliament is changing even faster. A report on a conference in Pavlograd of representatives of workers and strike committes, social organizations, political parties with a democratic orientation, and Ukrainian people's deputies appeared recently in central and republic newspapers. The main result of this conference is the beginning of the mass organization of strike committees at all levels, from enterprise to oblast, and the coordination of their actions and joint steps with organizations and political parties of a democratic orientation.

In practice this may mean not just that parallel structures of power are forming before our very eyes, but also that they are pooling their efforts in order to achieve common aims. In the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet the "Narodna Rada" has already taken it upon itself to represent the interests of the organizational committee of the All-Ukrainian Association of Strike Committees.

The near future will show what form the alliance of the democrats and the workers movement in the Ukraine will take, and what results it produces. The election of the republic strike committee is scheduled for June. Meanwhile the USSR President's Decree "On Urgent Measures To Ensure The Stable Functioning Of The National Economy's Base Sectors" is being carefully studied in the republic Supreme Soviet commissions. The opposition has declared from the session's rostrum that this document is at variance with the republic's laws.

Muravskiy Appointed Moldovan Prime Minister

LD2805134391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1228 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Kishinev, 28 May (TASS)—The parliament of Moldova today backed the republican president's proposal to appoint 42-year old economist Valeriy Muravskiy prime minister of Moldova.

One hundred and eighty-five deputies voted for him, and 53 against.

Valeriy Muravskiy replaces in this post Mircha Druk, who was the subject of a vote of no-confidence in parliament last week.

The MOLDOVA-PRES agency reports that Muravskiy previously worked in various posts in the republican prices committee, the republican Ministry of Construction, and the republican Ministry of Finance. In June last year he was appointed minister of finance, and in March this year deputy premier.

Presenting his program to parliament, the new premier evaluated the current state of the republic's economy as "chaotic." He cited as one of the priority tasks the need to adopt laws on privatization, on the republican bank, and on the bases of local self-government. He also advocated strengthening executive power, advocated

greater trust in the government and its structures in the localities, and advocated strengthening discipline and order in production.

Valeriy Muravskiy stressed that he favors achieving independence for Moldova and sees the future of the republic in economic integration with European countries. At the same time, he advocated establishing economic ties with other Union republics on new foundations, which will in his opinion enable Moldova to overcome the economic crisis.

Caucasus

Armenian President on Independence Process

PM2905074691 Paris LE MONDE in French 26-27 May 91 p 4

[Interview with Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan by Sophie Shihab in Paris—date not given, first paragrpah is introduction]

[Text] Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan on a visit to Paris where he had talks with Mr. Mitterrand on Wednesday 22 May, said in a press conference Friday that he received "an assurance that France supports the right of peoples to determine their own future" but that he simply "hopes" to "be able to count on its support for the process of accession to Armenian independence which is being carried out in accordance with the Soviet Constitution." Mr. Ter-Petrosyan also said he "did not believe" in the agreement signed on 23 April by Mr. Gorbachev and the nine republican leaders who support a union treaty.

"The contradictions among the signatories of the compromise are so deep—particularly between the "center" and Russia, but also between the center and the Ukraine or Kazakhstan—that they will not be able to make it succeed," Mr. Ter-Petrosyan said in an interview to LE MONDE. He sees this agreement primarily as "a propaganda approach": According to him, Mr. Gorbachev wants "to convince the public that he still controls the situation in the USSR and still has a role to play," whereas Mr. Yeltsin needs to prove, for the purposes of his campaign for election as Russian president, that he does not reject the dialogue in which the press in the USSR and in the West is urging him to engage.

In addition, the Armenian president thinks that Mr. Gorbachev has given no recent sign "of a new swing toward the reformers." "You just have to look at the composition of the security council surrounding the Soviet president: The new members—alongside the chiefs of the army, the interior ministry, and the KGB—are mere faithful executors of his policy," he said. With regard to the new economic plan which reformer Grigoriy Yavlinskiy is currently drawing up with the help of American experts and with Mr. Gorbachev's blessing, the Armenian leader fears that it will once again get no further than the planning stage.

More specifically, the signing of the 23 April agreement was immediately followed by the Soviet army's offensive, with Mr. Gorbachev's full support, against the Armenians in Azerbaijan and the border villages which killed dozens of people and produced around 4,000 new Armenian refugees. Mr. Ter-Petrosyn sees a direct relationship in this: Azerbaijani President Mutalibov, a signatory of the agreement, justified himself to his reluctant public by the fact that Moscow had, in exchange, permitted the "liberation" of several Armenian villages in Azerbaijan.

Mr. Pavlov's Anticrisis Plan

The other main reason for the Soviet army's offensive, according to the Armenian president, is that Mr. Gorbachev has not abandoned the idea of preserving the USSR's integrity and that, to do so, he had to try to deter the Armenians who intend to vote in favor of independence within five years in the republic's referendum on 21 September. "That is a period which we regard as realistic for building real independence," Mr. Ter-Petrosyan stressed. But he immediately added that it is not so much Armenia which presents Mr. Gorbachev with a problem because, for geopolitical reasons, it will probably maintain stronger links with Russia than neighboring Azerbaijan. The problem is that it is the only republic which can secede, under the terms of the law drawn up in Moscow, because, being ethnically homogeneous, it is also the only one for which this separation would not lead to territorial losses. Because of that very fact it is a dangerous example because, according to its president, "no Soviet republic, even if it currently wishes to remain in the Union, will wish to do so when one of them has been recognized as independent by the international community." The three Baltic republics may be in a different position with their specific status of independent countries recognized as such between the two wars.

For Mr. Ter-Petrosyan, the political disintegration of the Soviet empire is ultimately inevitable, but so is the maintenance of economic cooperation structures between the republics. That is how he explains the signature which Armenia placed on Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov's "anticrisis plan" at the beginning of May at a time when it was condemning the "undeclared war" being waged against it by the USSR.

"Twelve other republics also signed it, including Lithuania, but it is Russia and the Ukraine which waged the struggle and Mr. Pavlov made all the concessions, giving the repbublics authority over the main economic spheres," Mr. Ter-Petrosyan said. But he thinks this is a game being played by the "center" which is sure of shortly being able to blame the republics for the coming social and economic crises. Mr. Gorbachev is playing that game, the Armenian president thinks, "because he still has military intelligence services which are operating throughout the Soviet Union, but he has no body capable of putting up a general and centralized opposition to

political instability, economic anarchy, and the terrible drop in the volume of production and living standards."

Armenian Communist Leader Approves Border Talks

LD2905064391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1617 GMT 28 May 91

[By unidentified TASS correspondent]

[Text] Yerevan, 28 May (TASS)—The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has approved the activities of the delegation of that party at talks in Moscow from 20 to 24 May with a delegation of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan and at the meeting with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, at which ways to settle the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh were discussed.

Today in the local party press, Aram Sarkisyan, leader of the Armenian Communist Party, named the main result of interparty meeting in Moscow as an accord with the center and the Azerbaijani side to organize interstate talks between Armenia and Azerbaijan in order to withdraw subunits of the Azerbaijani special purpose militia detachments from the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous oblast and Azerbaijani rayons populated by Armenians near the border of the two republics.

As the leader of the Armenian Communist Party said, the forthcoming talks "will assist in the restoration of local soviet and party bodies in Nagorno-Karabakh" and the opening of Stepanakert airport. Another topic for future talks is "to eliminate the deportation of the Armenian population from Azerbaijan and to create conditions for the return of refugees to places of their permanent abode, having ensured their safety."

Aram Sarkisyan noted that the Communist Party of Armenia, as a political organization, considers it its first duty to be "the use of all means to weaken tension in region and to ensure the safety" of inhabitants in Armenian-populated rayons in Azerbaijan.

Azerbaijan Lawmakers Discuss Normalizing Situation

LD2605042791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 25 May 91

[Report on Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet session in Baku by correspondent Islam Kuliyev—recorded]

[Text] [Kuliyev] There are lines at the microphones after every speaker finishes a report. The speakers have to answer numerous, sometimes very difficult, questions. The sharpest discussion was on the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh. Many different proposals and views on the normalization of the situation in this hotspot were expressed. This is what (Tamerlan Garayev), deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Azerbaijan and a people's deputy of Azerbaijan, said:

[(Garayev)] Trips, observations, and contacts show that it is quite possible to normalize the situation. If the territory is freed of the formations, then clearly it is possible to learn about public opinion, to influence public opinion, and to conduct talks. This is not a task to be fulfilled in one day. The real work will begin in normalizing the situation. That is why the task to clear the territory of formations has begun now. Naturally, when the armed groups that are being disarmed show resistance, when blood is shed and people killed, this is war. When full disarmament of such groups is concluded, the serious and real work will begin. I do not see any other way of normalizing the situation.

Azerbaijan Adopts Law on Economic Independence

LD2605083191 Moscow TASS in English 0648 GMT 26 May 91

[Text] Baku May 26 AZERINFORM-TASS—The Azerbaijani Parliament on Saturday adopted a law on the principles of the republic's economic independence.

Addressing the Parliament session, Z. Samed-Zade, chairman of the Standing Commission for Economic Affairs and a corresponding member of the Republican Academy of Sciences, said the implementation of the law would help Azerbaijan lay down a solid foundation of economic independence without renouncing the development of the established economic, cultural and other contacts between the centre and republics.

Many of the deputies who took part in the discussion of the republic's economic independence issue believe that only economic independence can create the necessary prerequisites for Azerbaijan's political sovereignty.

The Parliament expressed its attitude to a draft treaty on a union of "sovereign republics". It is precisely a renewed democratic union that will be able to ensure a successful transition to new economic relations and political stability of each republic.

However, a majority of the members of parliament believe that, along with rights and powers, the treaty should clearly define the obligations of the centre and the Union to uphold the legitimate rights and interests and defend the territorial integrity and safety of citizens of each Union republic.

The Azerbaijani Parliament adopted a statement on Nagorno-Karabakh and on areas which border on Armenia. The statement again expresses the Azerbaijani people's will for a peaceful settlement of the Karabakh conflict and at the same time emphasised its determination to prevent an interference in the internal affairs of the sovereign republic.

By deputies' decision, the text of the statement will be referred to the parliaments of the USSR, Union republics and other countries.

Military Steps Up Efforts in NKAO

LD2805172391 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 28 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert May 28 TASS—Although the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh, and Azerbaijani region populated mainly by Armenians, has somewhat stabilized, shooting still can be heard every night

In this zone ripped apart by an inter-ethnic conflict. Military posts and Armenian and Azeri villages often come under fire. In many cases Soviet Interior Ministry troops deployed in villages and towns of Nagorno-Karabakh respond in kind.

Recently the determination with which army troops seek to suppress illegal activities has considerably increased. The role of conflict healers, entrusted to them by Soviet regulatory enactments referring to Nagorno-Karabakh, permits them to exercise a positive influence on the region's economic life: Troops escort truck convoys and protect vitally important installations.

The military are also seeking to curtail the epidemic of driving away herds of cattle. On Monday night and the early hours of Tuesday, Interior Ministry troops rescued a herd of 100 cows driven away from an Armenian village in the Askeran district and released two shepherds who had been taken hostage.

This is the third such case in the past four days. On the whole, nearly 8000 heads of cattle, or about one-half of the total number in the region, have been driven away from different farms over the past 12 months.

Georgian President Holds News Conference 28 May

OW2905055091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] Having won general elections in Georgia Zviad Gamsakhurdia, now President of the republic, held a press-conference, declaring that "the elections proved groundless the accusations levelled against him by the opposition".

He called journalists' attention to the upcoming negotiations with leader of the Russian republic Boris Yeltsin and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Answering questions on his proposed foreign policy, Gamsakhurdia emphasised he will "first and foremost seek the international recognition of Georgia as an independent state". He said preparation is underway for his meeting with American President George Bush and a number of East European leaders. A delegation of the U.S. Congress is scheduled to visit Georgia in August.

The President also said Georgia will attend a meeting of the six republics that decided to stay out of the Union treaty. The idea of the conference he said was to "form a united anti-imperialist front and together campaign for freedom".

USSR Accused of Supporting Ossetians

AU2705094691 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 1 May 91 p 1

[Gamsakhurdia and Georgian Supreme Soviet message to Perez de Cuellar and to the peoples and parliaments of the world, 27 April 1991, Tbilisi]

[Text] Being on the verge of collapse, the Soviet empire, frantically clinging to power, is trying to stir up the enslaved peoples of the empire against one another and push them to the brink. This is particularly true in the case of the Caucasus where, over many centuries, peoples of dissimilar origins and faiths but closely connected spiritually and by virtue of their traditions have lived side by side.

It is common knowledge that the empire used so-called interethnic conflicts for suppressing the proud and freedom-loving Caucasians. For that purpose, they relied upon local residents—traitors of their own people and real enemies of the Caucasian peoples. That is how centers of tension were created and are still being created; here and there, blood is already being shed and in some places genocide of the indigenous population is being prepared.

With the help of the mass media, the empire is doing everything in order to convince the world that the Caucasian "savages and cannibals" will destroy one another if the center does not intervene.

As the next link in the chain of the "interethnic conflicts" already instigated in the Caucasus, the Kremlin has chosen, primarily, Georgia and the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic. This is clearly attested to by the following facts:

1. Without any coordination with the authorities of the Republic of Georgia, numerous troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs have been brought to a Georgian territory—the so-called "South Ossetian Autonomous Region" (the historical Shida Kartli, that is to say, Inner Georgia). This region was artificially created following the annexation of Georgia by Soviet Russia in 1921. The Soviet troops, together with Ossetian extremists who are well disposed toward communist ideology, are making pogroms and are killing and arresting the Georgian population; many people have been killed and wounded. Submachine guns, rockets, mortar shells, hand grenades, and other weapons are being used against the Georgians. Lawyers are not allowed to talk to Georgians under arrest. The "National Salvation Committee," created by Soviet troops in Shida Kartli, nominate, without authorization, the "procurator" and functionaries.

Human rights are being brazenly violated; through the fault of the Army, ten Georgian villages have found themselves under severe blockade, famine has started there and medicines have run low. There is a continuous flow of Georgian and Ossetian refugees from the region; their number already exceeds 30,000. The central mass media of the Soviet Union distort and conceal the truth about the actual situation and do everything to cover up the illegal actions of the Army and of the extremists. The center's goal is to exile the Georgian population from the region and to add this territory to North Ossetia.

2. Over the last two years, the Union mass media have been actively spreading the opinion about the Russophobic sentiments of the Chechens and Ingushes, and this, in turn, has contributed to a further expansion of the so-called Russian great-power chauvinism. To this end, rumors are being deliberately spread to the effect that the Vainakhs (the Chechens and Ingushes) are about to attack the Russian population.

In Moscow and in other cities of the empire the opinion is being deliberately spread as though the Vainakhs residing there are members of the vicious "Chechen mafia" and racketeers.

3. To provoke the "interethnic conflict" in the Republic of Georgia, in particular, in Shida Kartli (the former South Ossetian Autonomous Region) and to justify the punitive actions against the Vainakhs, the center has intensively stirred up the Vainakhs and the neighboring peoples against one another:

A) Even the central press itself no longer conceals the fact that armed formations of the Cossacks residing in the Caucasus are being intensively created and given weapons under the pretext of promoting their cultural rebirth.

B) A major bloody conflict between the Ingush and Ossetian populations is being specially prepared on the Vainakhs' historical lands adjacent to the territory of the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic. Today, 46 percent of the area of these lands are part of the North Ossetian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. There is an attempt to provoke a similar conflict at the border between the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic and Dagestan. The center, in every way promoting the arming of the obedient and mercenary-minded Ossetian extremists, is trying precisely through them to exemplarily punish the "recalcitrant" Vainakhs; it is doing everything to prevent the Chechens and Ingushes, illegally deported to Soviet Central Asia in 1944, from returning to their homeland. This further aggravates and exacerbates the controversy between the Vainakhs and Ossetians. The Kremlin is bringing large numbers of Soviet Army units and internal troops to the land of the Vainakhs in order to kill the proud spirit of the Vainakhs, whose culture dates back to ancient times, and to suppress their aspiration for independence. This is being done allegedly for the purpose of settling the "interethnic conflicts" that it instigated itself. Incidentally, already twice over the current century, the Vainakhs have experienced the whole bitterness of losing their homeland. It appears that the agonizing empire is preparing unprecedented bloody terror and genocide in Chechen-Ingushetia for the third time. Confrontation between the Ingushes and Ossetians have already started, there are casualties, and many people have been wounded. Here too, the Soviet troops are taking the side of the Ossetian extremists.

The Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet session, having discussed, at its extraordinary meeting, the alarming situation that has taken shape in Shida Kartli and in the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic, is appealing to the United Nations Organization and the peoples and parliaments of the world to condemn the insidious intentions of the empire and to give support to the freedom-loving and proud Georgian, Chechen, and Ingush peoples in order to avert the terrible tragedy planned by the Kremlin.

We are looking forward to receiving your support and **are asking you to commission to Georgia and northern Caucasus experts in human rights protection who will study facts of flagrant violations of the rights of Georgians, Chechens, Ingushes, and representatives of other peoples and will map out measures for stopping these violations.**

[signed] Yours respectfully, the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia. Zviad Gamsakhurdia, President of the Republic of Georgia.

27 April 1991, Tbilisi.

Central Asia

Gorbachev Arrives in Kazakhstan for Visit

LD2805172191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev arrived in Kokchetav today. Our special correspondent Vladimir Perfilyev reports:

[Perfilyev] Mikhail Sergeyevich was met at the local airport by President of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev and other republican and oblast leaders. Kazakhstan is an abundant republic, and right at the steps of the plane girls in national costume presented Mikhail Sergeyevich with a magnificent round loaf of virgin bread. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Nursultan Nazarbayev laid flowers at the statue of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin in the oblast center. The country's president conversed with the city's residents about urgent problems.

[Begin Gorbachev recording] I see people of Kazakhstan—Kazakhs, Russians, Ukrainians, and Germans—are for the union, for the union. Fine. I have to say frankly that at present, in this difficult situation,

Kazakhstan is working, toiling, is united and harmonious, and the situation, so it is said, has (?recently) been good. [passage indistinct: crowd noise]

So, people who want to work on the land, first the peasants themselves, should be given private subsidiary plots, townwellers should be given land for gardens, for allotments, for their houses, so that everything can be built and so that things can be grown. [passage indistinct: crowd noise]

I see this does not exist here. I think that society has turned toward (?success), and those who are today going to appeal, to incite [words indistinct]; I think people will not support this. But I think we will (?manage), because we must. We have reached the most difficult stage. Matters must now be tackled, otherwise we will miss the opportunity and then we will be sorry. And it is particularly important that we proceed—there is now understanding of this, especially following the referendum (?toward a union, a union, and let the treaty come as soon as possible). And here I have to say that both the example of your republic and the stance of your leadership are very (?helpful). Well done you, for working well and living harmoniously here. [end recording]

[Perfilyev] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the accompanying officials then left for the (Zolotopolskiy) state farm in Shushenskiy rayon. Meetings were also held here, and conversations took place about how things are going on the land. Tomorrow, according to his itinerary, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and accompanying officials will leave for Chimkent.

Hails Kokchetav Crowd

LD2805212591

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian in its 1800 GMT "Vremya" newscast on 28 May, carries a 2-minute video report by correspondent S. Medvedev from Kokchetav Oblast, which he describes as a grain growing area. The presidential plane landed at the local airport today. The video shows Mikhail and Raisa Gorbachev deplaning and being met by Kazakhstan President Nazarbayev and others. Immediately after this, at the approaches to Kokchetav, Gorbachev meets local residents. He is shown talking to a crowd in the street.

Gorbachev asks: Well, how are you?" The crowd reply: "Fine, Mikhail Sergeyevich." Gorbachev says: "I thank the Kazakhstan people for reliably supporting this policy. The republic works hard, it is trying, despite all the difficulties, and it is a good supporting for the union, for its preservation. It is this internationalism that has united people on this soil and is working hard for the whole country. Thank you. Keep it up! Don't just keep it up, do even better!"

Visits Kazakhstan State Farm

LD2805201991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 28 May 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] On the central square of Kokchetav, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan laid flowers at the Lenin monument. Meetings, questions, discussions, are now no longer on urban but also on rural streets.

It is here that one can answer the question why there is even more food in Kokchetav shops than in neighboring oblasts. According to statistics here, there are 20 kg of meat more per head of population than in the republic overall. Where does it come from, you ask. Mainly from the development of private farmsteads, leasehold and private farming. Owners of bullocks and heifers are glad to sell their meat both to consumer cooperatives and the state. The head of such a farmstead, Nikolay Vasilyevich Moiseyev from (Zhenantus) state farm, today received the high-ranking guests in his house. He is leader of a leasehold arable farming team. So he spoke not only about his own private plot—he has three cows and some poultry—but also about the state farm's affairs. Both they and the neighbors are today already two weeks late with the sowing. This spring is dry and hot and rain fell only yesterday, so they will have to carry on working with their sowing equipment. Equipment, especially components, is in acutely short suply, more acutely then ever. The machine operators are still on iron rations today and there is also trouble with water in this beautiful village of Aleksandrovka. There are no pipes for the water main and they can not be obtained anywhere. Pipe manufacture, as you know, has declined in the country.

This too was the topic of conversation in Aleksandrovka both with its inhabitants and with the leaders of Kazakhstan. To make things better, the president said, first of all there must be an end to street politics, and order must be restored in production. Without this there will be no change. Kazakhstan, like other republics, is too dependent on how things are going in the country overall.

Comments on Kazakhstan Successes

LD2805215191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 28 May 91

[Interview with President M.S. Gorbachev, with remarks by Kazakhstan President N. Nazanbayev, in Kokchetav on 28 May; by unidentified correspondent; recorded—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent] Today's bright, warm spring day, with poplar pollen flying about, seems to dispose people to seek contact. There were entire queues of people with questions to ask the president. We, too, asked ours. By the way, afterwards it was repeated in virtually every conversation.

Mikhail Sergeyevich, may we ask you a question—"Vremya" program.

[Gorbachev] Oh, you are already here?

[Correspondent] Yes. In the press Kazakhstan is called one of the most stable republics in the union. Is this not one of the main reasons for your stay here?

[Gorbachev] You know, there are many reasons. First, it is a long time since I was here and promises were made. Moreover, a year ago, I was to travel down here and I did not. That is why, first, a promise had to be fulfilled.

Second, Kazakhstan is after all a huge republic and a multinational one. Our entire world is present here. There is everything, so to speak, in this republic, everything can be seen. But what I like and what I value very highly now in the activities and the life of Kazakhstan: Kazakhstan is working, Kazakhstan is stable, Kazakhstan is devoted to the Union, it is united. This is very important and I want to tell this to the Kazakhstan people so that they would know that we see, value, and understand, and to support the leadership, becauses it is acting with great responsibility. This is the first thing. Second, well, simply to associate with people, to listen to what people are thinking...

[Nazarbayev, interrupting] It is simply that you have not been to Kazakhstan for a long time.

[Gorbachev] ...about all our affairs, to listen. You see, what interesting things they are saying. You see that shop there, I am only trying to find out whether everything is like that, every day. Well, they say, perhaps sometimes it is a little bit worse. On holiday occasions it is also better sometimes, on ordinary days everything is worse sometimes.

[Correspondent] It is no secret that shops are being prepared specially for the arrival of the first leaders, and specially...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] I was asking the buyers, there they are, incidentally, and there, at the entrance and they say: Today it is perhaps better, but usually it is a common shop. An interesting system is operating here. It turns out that "oblpotrebsoyuz" [oblast union of consumer cooperatives]—this is cooperative trade, it has its subsidiary farm which, as a regulator, permanently maintains deliveries here. It maintains ties with the entire rural population, purchases excess cattle from it, it has its processing enterprises, it has its freezers, that is to say, in the past few years, they have created a base.

[Nazarbayev] With the turnover not going down.

[Gorbachev] That is why this keeps moving. Prices are of course exorbitant, prices are exorbitant. But people understand that this is a hard job.

[Unidentified man] [words indistinct]

[Gorbachev] Yes, yes.

[Correspondent] Will there be some practical results after this trip? Are you planning—perhaps this will take the form of some decisions?

[Gorbachev] You know what it is, I think? By my arrival here I want to stress the need to follow the path and to act in the way people are acting there on this Kazakhstan land. This is the most important thing. Because in order for everything to take place it is necessary to act and go forward—not look back—rationally, in a balanced way, and responsibly.